

Now and then a man says, "Why are not we just as efficient as the Germans?" Efficient for what? We are more efficient than they are for peace and for civilization and for God love and for man love. But if you mean by that, Shall we be equally efficient for the work of slaughter? we must confess that we have not been, and we are not even now. That has been their study. That has been their education. We have been thinking about schools and industry and the rights of man and the liberty of the individual and equal opportunity among men. We have been trying to extend all that, and they have been thinking about the efficiency of man force and munition force to win a war. Does that prove that they are superior to us? It does prove that they are superior in that particular, and they are until yet, and they are proving it upon the battle field of Europe to-day. But shall we quit for that reason, when we stand with the sunlight of God upon our heads, pointing the way toward enlightenment from a present half civilization?

Mr. President, there will be a peace at the end of this war, and it will be a peace dictated by us and accepted by Germany and Austria-Hungary and Turkey and Bulgaria. By the way, one of the curious things about this business is that the Germans have so far camouflaged the world that they have made it imagine that Germany was fighting the world. The most militaristic nation in the world, Turkey, and the next most militaristic nation in the world, Bulgaria, are on the German side, and the direct blood descendants of the Huns who followed Attila, the Hungarians or Magyars, are also upon the German side; and the direct descendants of the Goths and the Visigoths and the Ostrogoths and the Vandals are the Germans themselves.

Germany has not fought the world. Germany, plus all the remarkably militaristically trained nations, has been fighting the peaceful nations of the world, and it is not at all astonishing that we should have been whipped in the beginning. There never has been a better private soldier than the Turk. He believes that when he dies upon the field of battle he goes to paradise. If you or I had any such infernal fool idea, we would die very willingly; at least I would, because I would be glad to know that after this life I would go to paradise. I have had a whole lot of doubt about it.

Mr. President, we will talk peace whenever we dictate peace and Germany and Austria and Turkey and Bulgaria accept it. Then what are we going to do after peace is declared? We are fighting "to make the world safe for democracy," said the President of the United States.

I go further and say that we are fighting to make the world safe for liberty, individual liberty, man liberty, "the rights of man"—"liberty, fraternity, and equality"—in the words of the French revolutionists; words which they merely expressed from a fact that they had seen in America, when we had won our independence. But after we make the world safe for liberty and democracy, and beyond that, for humanity, for justice and mercy and love and God—the Christian God—and if there be no Christian God, then this earth is hell anyhow, and let it go, and let the Prussians have it—then what have we got to do after that is all over with? Why, Mr. President, we have got to fight to make democracy safe for the world. This is a harder task even than winning the war.

After we have made the world safe for democracy we have got to make democracy safe for the world. Is democracy safe for the world now? Oh, look at Russia. Look at the bolsheviks. Look at the I. W. W.'s in America. Look at the Sinn Feiners in Ireland. Look at all of them. You know as well as I do that democracy is not safe for the world now.

How are you going to make it safe for the world? I answer render it, first, intelligent. Make it intelligent. Render it, second, just. Make justice its religion. Fill it, in the third place, with the love of God and of man, and especially of the love of man, because God is away off, and He Himself has told us that if we love our neighbor well we will love Him all right. Then, after you have done that, the world is safe. Even if we whip the unspeakable Turk, and the barbarous Bulgarian, and the inexpressible Hun in Austria, and the direct descendants of the Goths and the Vandals in Germany, we shall have accomplished nothing unless we can make democracy—our cause—safe for the world, safe for humanity, and safe for the cause of God and of Jesus of Nazareth, who taught love of our neighbor.

Mr. President, in concluding I want to say that during this entire session of Congress I have not heard a single thing that pleased me as much as the speech just made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I had no idea of following up his speech except that it inspired me with a few words that I could not help uttering.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., Thursday, April 11, 1918) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 12, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 11, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Franklin K. Fretz, pastor St. John's Lutheran Church, Easton, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God, our heavenly Father, Thou art King of kings and Lord of lords. We come to Thee because we are weak and Thou art strong, we are ignorant and Thou art eternal wisdom, we grope in darkness and Thou dwellest in light unapproachable. We ask Thy divine blessing upon the President and Congress of the United States and all representatives of government. Do Thou bless our Nation. May it ever be "the land of the free and the home of the brave." Let Thy blessing rest upon those who are now receiving a baptism of fire. Strengthen and sustain the dying and comfort the sad. Grant us a speedy victory and Thy peace in our day. May the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep our hearts and minds, through Christ Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 383) to punish the destruction or injury of war material and war transportation facilities by fire, explosives, or other violent means, and to forbid hostile use of property during time of war, and for other purposes, had further insisted upon its disagreement to said amendments, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. NELSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9504) to amend section 4067 of the Revised Statutes by extending its scope to include women.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3528. An act to suspend for the period of the present war sections 45, 46, and 56 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes;

S. 2917. An act to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes"; and

S. 3863. An act to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases.

MAIL SERVICE ABROAD.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the answer of the Postmaster General to House resolution 296, which the House passed the other day—the resolution offered by Mr. TREADWAY. It is in response to that resolution. It is addressed to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. DYER. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TREADWAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Why is that not an official document if it is addressed to the Speaker instead of to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. COX. It is not addressed to "the gentleman from Indiana." It is addressed to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. Why then is it not inserted in the Record?

Mr. COX. The gentleman can see it in the Record if the House gives unanimous consent.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Inasmuch as this communication is addressed to the Speaker in response to a resolution passed by the House, I want to ask why it is not laid before the House and read?

The SPEAKER. If it is addressed to the Speaker of the House, it will be laid before the House, but the Chair did not know anything about it. The Chair will state that if he were to lay all the communications that he gets before the House the

House would not have a chance to do anything else but receive them. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate that; but the gentleman from Indiana stated that it was in response to the resolution of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not seen it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask that it be laid before the House.

Mr. GILLET. How did the gentleman from Indiana get it? [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. I got it in a lawful way. It was not in any way purloined. [Laughter.]

Mr. DYER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. DYER. I want to inquire if this is the proper way for a reply of the Postmaster General to a resolution of the House to be presented?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to present it. Is that what the gentleman wants?

Mr. DYER. I understand that the gentleman from Indiana has asked to have the matter presented.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Missouri been paying attention to the proceedings?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced that he would lay it before the House. What more does the gentleman want?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Before the matter is laid before the House I desire to ask if the communication is addressed to the Speaker?

Mr. COX. It is.

Mr. WALSH. And if it is, is it an instance of the efficiency of the Post Office Department that it should be presented by the gentleman from Indiana instead of by the Speaker? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Post Office Department is not responsible for anything that the gentleman from Indiana does. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. It is rather an anomalous position that gentlemen assume when they ask for information, that they should object to its presentation when it is furnished.

Mr. DALLINGER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. DALLINGER. How did the gentleman from Indiana happen to have it?

The SPEAKER. The way that came to him was that when it came the clerk gave it to him knowing that he was interested in it.

Mr. FOSTER. The regular order, Mr. Speaker. It seems they do not want it read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1918.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Replying to House resolution 296:

"Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to furnish the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, information relative to the amount of mail matter which has been addressed to members of the American Expeditionary Force during the past 30 days of the class which has now been restricted in transportation; also information relative to the amount of mail matter that has been sent to members of the American Expeditionary Force by the Committee on Public Information, how it has been distributed, and whether mail matter of this kind has been restricted in further transportation."

I beg to advise as follows:

The class of mail to the American Expeditionary Force which has now been restricted in transportation is parcel post. This matter was excluded from the mails to the troops in pursuance to an order issued at the request of the War Department, which acted upon the report of a board comprised of representatives of the war-work branches of the American Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Knights of Columbus, and of the War and the Post Office Departments. The amount of this mail during the month of March was 53,617 sacks, weighing 876 tons, and comprising approximately 2,808,903 parcels.

The resolution calls for "information relative to the amount of mail matter that has been sent to members of the American Expeditionary Force by the Committee on Public Information, how it has been distributed, and whether mail matter of this kind has been restricted in further transportation." If matter of the kind herein referred to has been sent, it has been of such relatively small quantity that it has never been called to the attention of the Post Office Department, and no request has been made by the military authorities looking to its restriction. Having no reports in the records of the department of the character of mail matter mentioned in the resolution and in the debate thereon, I caused inquiry to be made and have learned that the only mail matter of this kind sent to soldiers by the Secretary of the Treasury were bulk shipments to Gen. Pershing of copies of his speech delivered before the men of the National Army at Camp Lewis in the State of Washington, giving detailed information on the war-insurance

law and liberty bonds, also some posters calling attention to the second and third issues of the liberty bonds. On this subject, Mr. G. R. Cooksey, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of April 8, 1918, advises as follows:

"Replying to your inquiry over the telephone with regard to documents from the Treasury Department mailed to our soldiers in France, permit me to advise you as follows:

"The only speech of the Secretary's which was mailed to our soldiers abroad was one delivered before the men of the National Army at Camp Lewis, American Lake, Wash., dealing with the war-risk insurance act. In connection with the administration of the war-risk act, the Treasury Department has felt it exceedingly important that every soldier and sailor in our Army and Navy be advised of his rights under the law and every effort has been made to get this information to them. It was essential that they know the benefits conferred by the right to take out insurance and particularly that there was a limitation upon the time within which such insurance could be issued. As one step in a campaign of education in this connection, a conference was held in Washington attended by officers and enlisted men from various cantonments in this country. The law was explained to them and they were eager to obtain every written statement and address on the subject. They were particularly anxious to have the address delivered by the Secretary at Camp Lewis. It was in response to this demand that the Secretary's speech was mailed. In mailing it abroad it was sent in one shipment to Gen. Pershing for distribution.

"In addition to this speech, the only material mailed from the Treasury Department to the Army in France was a supply of liberty-loan posters for the second and third liberty loans. These were mailed to Gen. Pershing in one shipment each several weeks in advance of the loans and were sent for the purpose of showing the men of our Army in France the efforts that were being made at home to sustain them and also as an appeal to Americans abroad to subscribe to the loan.

"Aside from the above, a letter addressed by the Secretary to officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy, advising them of their rights under the war-risk insurance act (copy inclosed) and an address by Judge Mark explaining the law were sent by the War Department to the Army in France. These did not go by mail, however, but by Army transport."

On inquiry of the Committee on Public Information, I am informed that this committee has never sent its literature to members of the American Expeditionary Force, except 500 copies of the Official Bulletin in bulk to Gen. Pershing for distribution among the officers. This information is given in the following letter from the chairman of the Committee on Public Information:

"Answering your request for 'information relative to the amount of mail matter that has been sent to members of the American Expeditionary Force by the Committee on Public Information,' I beg to state that this committee has never at any time sent its literature to the members of the Expeditionary Force. Numberless individuals and even great patriotic societies have protested continuously against this decision, but even if I did not have the conviction that our soldiers in France are in no need of 'educational work,' there were the vital questions of tonnage and transportation to consider.

"When Mr. TREADWAY stated in the House that he was 'reliably informed that there has been a very large amount of that class of mail matter sent over,' and 'it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter have been placed in their hands overseas,' he made assertions the absolute baselessness of which could have been ascertained by a telephone inquiry.

"As for our shipments of pamphlets to France as a whole, these have been made upon request to Young Men's Christian Association officials, diplomatic and consular representatives, and certain officers of education, and do not exceed 1,000 in number for the year. Even the material for aeroplane distribution is not shipped from the United States, but is printed in France in cooperation with the French Government.

"At the request of the authorities, 500 copies of the Official Bulletin were sent in bulk to Gen. Pershing for distribution among the officers, but even this has been discontinued to ease the transportation situation."

I take it that the inquiry in the concluding paragraph of the resolution, "whether mail matter of this kind has been restricted in further transportation," has reference to all matter which is sent out by individuals under their franks, or by departments under the penalty privilege, and I have, therefore, directed that an investigation be made of all printed matter going to the troops to ascertain the quantity and character of such matter.

A. S. BURLISON,
Postmaster General.

Mr. TREADWAY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. TREADWAY. I rise to a question of personal privilege. I am not certain whether I have a question of personal privilege against any other than a Member of the House regarding a statement I made on the floor, but I certainly have a right to make a statement of personal privilege in the case of an official communication such as Mr. Creel has sent through Mr. Burlison.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is in response to a resolution.

Mr. TREADWAY. He accuses me of making a baseless statement. I did not do anything of the kind.

The SPEAKER. The better way, instead of taking time to puzzle out whether it is a question of personal privilege or not, would be for the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many statements made in relation to Mr. Creel, both in this branch and in the other, that I do not wish to add to the gentleman's trials and tribulations; but I would like to read the sentence

to which I object, and which I now move to strike from the Record, if that is proper. I read:

When Mr. TREADWAY stated in the House that he was "reliably informed that there has been a very large amount of that class of mail matter sent over," and "it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter have been placed in their hands overseas," he made assertions the absolute baselessness of which could have been ascertained by a telephone inquiry.

That statement was not "absolute baselessness," and I challenge Mr. Creel's veracity in so stating.

I can produce evidence here in this House that there has been placed in the hands of the soldiers abroad tons of literature. Whether sent over by Mr. Creel or by the Secretary of the Treasury, I know not; but it is there. I myself read a statement from a soldier, in which the soldier says, "If there is a lack of tonnage to transport boys over here, Mr. Hurley could get a good deal of tonnage space if fewer tons of Secretary McAdoo's speeches were transferred to us. We do not want them."

That is evidence from the front, from a boy in the trenches to-day. And therefore I say that Mr. Creel impugns the motives and the statements of a Member of this House when he uses that language in reference to the statement I made in connection with this investigation. The whole thing is peculiar in that this letter should come from a Member on the floor asking for insertion in the Record. I accept the Speaker's statement in that connection as the reason therefor, but it would seem to me—

Mr. BARNHART rose.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have only three minutes, but I would be glad to yield if the gentleman desires—

Mr. BARNHART. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Massachusetts has any information as to how this one soldier could know that there were tons and tons of literature coming over?

Mr. TREADWAY. I can satisfy the gentleman in that respect. The matter came to me in confidence, and I would not produce that statement on the floor here, but I can satisfy the gentleman that such a statement has been made by a soldier in a communication. It is a well-known fact that this form of literature is over there. I am not finding fault with its being there. I am finding fault with two things. One fault I have already expressed; the other I am endeavoring to express now. The first is that the Post Office Department has tried to stop, and has stopped, the sending of the necessary comforts to our boys from their home people. To my mind, and I know to any sensible man on this floor, you can not give any reason whatsoever why that restriction should be enforced. The other fault I am finding is with the statement made by Mr. Creel, in saying that a Member of this House has made a statement of absolute baselessness. He knows that we are not that kind of men. I impugn that statement, and I challenge him to prove it, and I move to strike it out of the Record in this document.

Mr. FOSTER. I make a point of order on that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object. I demand the regular order.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. What is the usual procedure in respect to this communication, now that it has been received by the Speaker and reported to the House and read in the hearing of the House?

The SPEAKER. To refer it to the Post Office Committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To refer it to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and order it printed.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Would a motion be in order that the House decline to receive it?

The SPEAKER. It undoubtedly would. The House once declined to receive one of President Roosevelt's messages.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Then I move that the House decline to receive this communication, and return it to the gentleman who wrote it, with the suggestion that it be changed so as to withdraw the charge made against a Member of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there was no charge made against a Member of the House. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House decline to receive this communication, and send it back to its author, with a certain suggestion, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] moves to table the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota. The question is on the latter motion. The question was taken.

Pending the announcement of the vote, Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 165, answered "present" 9, not voting 93, as follows:

YEAS—165.

Alexander	Dixon	Kincheloe	Shouse
Almon	Dominick	Kitchin	Sims
Ashbrook	Doelling	Lazaro	Sisson
Aswell	Doolittle	Lee, Ga.	Slayden
Ayres	Doremus	Leshner	Small
Bankhead	Drane	Lever	Smith, C. B.
Barkley	Eagle	Linthicum	Snook
Barnhart	Estopinal	Littlepage	Stengall
Bell	Evans	Loneragan	Stedman
Beshin	Ferris	Lunn	Steele
Black	Fields	McKeown	Stephens, Miss.
Blackmon	Flood	Maher	Sterling, Pa.
Blanton	Foster	Mansfield	Sullivan
Booher	Gard	Martin	Summers
Brand	Garner	Mays	Tague
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tenn.	Montague	Talbot
Buchanan	Garrett, Tex.	Nichols, S. C.	Taylor Ark.
Burnett	Goodwin, Ark.	Oldfield	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	Oliver, Ala.	Thompson
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, Ala.	Oliver, N. Y.	Tillman
Candler, Miss.	Gregg	O'Shaunessy	Venable
Cantrill	Griffin	Overmyer	Vinson
Caraway	Hamill	Overstreet	Walker
Carlin	Hamlin	Padgett	Walton
Carter, Okla.	Hardy	Park	Watkins
Church	Harrison, Va.	Pou	Watson, Va.
Clark, Fla.	Hastings	Price	Weaver
Claypool	Hayden	Quin	Webb
Cleary	Helm	Ragsdale	Welling
Connally, Tex.	Helvering	Rainey	Welty
Connelly, Kans.	Hilliard	Raker	Whaley
Cox	Holland	Romjue	White, Ohio
Crisp	Houston	Rouse	Wilson, La.
Crosser	Howard	Rubey	Wilson, Tex.
Dale, N. Y.	Hull, Tenn.	Rucker	Wingo
Delaney	Igoe	Russell	Wise
Dent	Jacoway	Sabath	Wright
Denton	Johnson, Ky.	Sanders, La.	Young, Tex.
Dewalt	Jones, Tex.	Shackleford	The Speaker
Dickinson	Keating	Shallenberger	
Dies	Kehoe	Sherley	
Dill	Kelly, Pa.	Sherwood	

NAYS—165.

Anthony	Fordney	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Austin	Francis	Lufkin	Schmitt
Bacharach	Frear	Lundeen	Scott, Mich.
Baer	Freeman	McArthur	Sells
Bland	French	McCormick	Siegel
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	McFadden	Sinnott
Britten	Garland	McKenzie	Slemp
Browne	Gillett	McKinley	Sloan
Browning	Glynn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Idaho
Burroughs	Goodall	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Butler	Graham, Ill.	Magee	Snell
Caldwell	Gray, N. J.	Mapes	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Green, Iowa	Mason	Steenerson
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	Meeker	Sterling, Ill.
Carter, Mass.	Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Stiness
Cary	Griest	Miller, Minn.	Strong
Chandler, Okla.	Hadley	Mondell	Sweet
Clark, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Moore, Pa.	Swift
Cooper, W. Va.	Haskell	Moore, Ind.	Switzer
Cooper, Wis.	Hawley	Morgan	Tilson
Crago	Hayes	Mott	Timberlake
Cramton	Hersey	Mudd	Tinkham
Currie, Mich.	Hull, Iowa	Nelson	Treadway
Dale, Vt.	Humphreys	Nichols, Mich.	Vestal
Dallinger	Husted	Nolan	Voigt
Darrow	Hutchinson	Osborne	Volstead
Davidson	Ireland	Paige	Waldow
Davis	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Dempsey	Kahn	Peters	Ward
Denison	Kearns	Platt	Watson
Dillon	Kennedy, Iowa	Pratt	Watson, Pa.
Dyer	Kennedy, R. I.	Purnell	Wheeler
Edmonds	Kiess, Pa.	Ramseyer	White, Me.
Elliott	King	Randall	Williams
Ellsworth	Kinkaid	Rankin	Winslow
Elston	Knutson	Reavis	Woods, Iowa
Emerson	Kraus	Reed	Woodyard
Esch	La Follette	Robbins	Young, N. Dak.
Fairchild, B. L.	Langley	Roberts	Zihlman
Fairfield	Lehbach	Rodenberg	
Farr	Lenroot	Rogers	
Focht	Little	Rowe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Beakes	Gould	Olney	Rayburn
Collier	Lea, Cal.	Phelan	Sears
Good			

NOT VOTING—93.

Anderson	Donovan	Gallagher	Hicks
Borland	Doughton	Gallivan	Hollingsworth
Brumbaugh	Dowell	Gandy	Hood
Byrnes, S. C.	Drukker	Glass	Huddleston
Carew	Dunn	Goodwin, N. C.	James
Chandler, N. Y.	Dupré	Graham, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.
Classon	Eagan	Hamilton, N. Y.	Jones, Va.
Coady	Fairchild, G. W.	Harrison, Miss.	Juhl
Cooper, Ohio	Fess	Haugen	Kelley, Mich.
Copley	Fisher	Heaton	Kettner
Costello	Flynn	Heflin	Key, Ohio
Curry, Cal.	Foss	Hefntz	Kreider
Decker	Fuller, Ill.	Hensley	LaGuardia

Larsen	Morin	Rowland	Taylor, Colo.
Lobeck	Neely	Sanders, N. Y.	Temple
London	Norton	Sanford	Templeton
McAndrews	Parker, N. Y.	Saunders, Va.	Towner
McClintic	Polk	Scott, Iowa	Van Dyke
McCulloch	Porter	Scott, Pa.	Vare
McLemore	Powers	Scully	Wilson, Ill.
Madden	Ramsey	Smith, T. F.	Wood, Ind.
Mann	Riordan	Snyder	
Miller, Wash.	Robinson	Stephens, Nebr.	
Moon	Rose	Stevenson	

So the motion to lay the motion of Mr. MILLER of Minnesota on the table was lost.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SEARS with Mr. DOWELL.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. COADY with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. GANDY with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. CLASSON.
 Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. ANDERSON.
 Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. COPLEY.
 Mr. DECKER with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. DUNN.
 Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. EAGAN with Mr. FESS.
 Mr. FISHER with Mr. FOSS.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. McANDREWS with Mr. FULLER of Illinois.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. HEATON.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.
 Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. JAMES.
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. HICKS.
 Mr. HUDDLESTON with Mr. JUUL.
 Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. KETTNER with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. MILLER of Washington.
 Mr. LARSEN with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. McCLINTIC with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. McLEMORE with Mr. McCULLOCH.
 Mr. MOON with Mr. ROSE.
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. POLK with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. TEMPLE.
 Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. TEMPLETON.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. VARE.

On this vote:

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi (for) with Mr. HAUGEN (against).

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] vote?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. GOOD. I voted "no." I am paired with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], and I withdraw that vote and answer "present."

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote. On this vote the yeas are 166 and the noes are 166, and the Chair votes "aye."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote, it is so close.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will recapitulate the vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can a Member who has voted on the roll call change his vote if he desires to do so? My understanding of the rule is that he can.

The SPEAKER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

The Clerk recapitulated the yeas.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REAVIS. If the recapitulation indicates one who has been erroneously recorded, when is the time to call the attention of the Speaker to it?

The SPEAKER. When his name is called.

Mr. REAVIS. May I ask whether my name is recorded in the affirmative?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded in the negative. Mr. REAVIS. When the Clerk read my name, he read it among the ayes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is mistaken. Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recorded as voting "aye"?

The SPEAKER. He is recorded as voting "aye."

Mr. GILLETT. I am told that he is not in the city. Will the Chair inquire if he is present?

The SPEAKER. Does any Member know if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] is in the House?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I just called his office a moment ago and was informed that he is not in the city.

The SPEAKER. Then, of course, his name should be stricken from the roll.

The Clerk then recapitulated those who voted in the negative.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" and in the recapitulation my name was not announced.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that he read the gentleman's name.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is recorded? The reason I inquire is that he was here immediately before the roll was called. My recollection is that he voted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSON, is not recorded.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman's name called on both roll calls, and he did not respond.

The Clerk recapitulated those who answered "present."

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting "no."

The SPEAKER. How did the gentleman vote?

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts. I answered "present."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not change his vote now. Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the decisions—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has read the decisions and they are antiquated—made before the new rules were adopted.

[For further explanation of Mr. FULLER's vote see subsequent proceedings.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PARKER, is recorded?

The SPEAKER. In the negative.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is the gentleman from New Jersey in the city?

Mr. BROWNING. He was here a few moments ago.

Mr. BUTLER. He sat beside me a minute ago.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey entered the Hall.

The SPEAKER. On this vote, as corrected, the yeas are 165 and the noes are 165, present 8, and the motion to lay the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota on the table is defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, has not the gentleman from Minnesota the floor?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I was standing here awaiting an opportunity—

The SPEAKER. The Chair saw the gentleman standing, but supposed he was listening.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I was doing that and trying to get the attention of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This situation is very well understood, and what the motive is behind it.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee wait until the Chair puts the request. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we understand perfectly what is involved here, and we understand the motive that lies behind this proposition. We understand that answer has been given to a resolution that was passed by the House by unanimous consent.

So far as the parliamentary situation is concerned, I want to say, because I desire always to be fair, that if the gentleman desires recognition or demands recognition, in my opinion he is entitled to it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion I previously made, and in its place substitute the following—and I just give this for the information of the Speaker and the House: I move that this communication be referred to a committee of five, to be appointed by the Speaker, for their consideration as to its character, with an appropriate recommendation from them to the House as to its disposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion and to substitute therefor a motion that this communication be referred to a select committee of five, to be selected by the Speaker. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the substitution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota, that the communication be referred to a select committee of five, to be selected by the Speaker.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. SHERLEY. And on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 175, answered "present," 2, not voting, 82, as follows:

YEAS—172.

Alexander	Dies	Kehoe	Saunders, Va.
Almon	Dill	Kelly, Pa.	Scully
Ashbrook	Dixon	Kincheloe	Shackelford
Aswell	Dominick	Kitchin	Shallenberger
Ayres	Dooling	Lazaro	Sherley
Bankhead	Doolittle	Lea, Cal.	Sherwood
Barkley	Doremus	Lee, Ga.	Shouse
Barnhart	Doughton	Leshner	Sims
Beakes	Drane	Lever	Sisson
Bell	Dupré	Linthicum	Slayden
Beshlin	Eagle	Littlepage	Small
Black	Evans	Loneragan	Smith, C. B.
Blackmon	Ferris	Lunn	Snook
Blanton	Fields	McKeown	Steagall
Booher	Fisher	Maher	Stedman
Brand	Foster	Mansfield	Steele
Brodbeck	Gard	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Brumbaugh	Garner	Mays	Sterling, Pa.
Buchanan	Garrett, Tenn.	Montague	Stevenson
Burnett	Garrett, Tex.	Nicholls, S. C.	Sullivan
Byrnes, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Oldfield	Sumners
Campbell, Pa.	Gordon	Oliver, Ala.	Taylor, Ark.
Candler, Miss.	Gray, Ala.	Oliver, N. Y.	Thomas
Cantrill	Gregg	Olney	Thompson
Caraway	Griffin	Overmyer	Tillman
Carlin	Hamill	Overstreet	Venable
Carter, Okla.	Hamlin	Padgett	Vinson
Church	Hardy	Park	Walker
Clark, Fla.	Harrison, Va.	Phelan	Walton
Claypool	Hastings	Pou	Watkins
Cleary	Hayden	Price	Watson, Va.
Collier	Helm	Quinn	Weaver
Connally, Tex.	Helvering	Ragsdale	Webb
Connolly, Kans.	Hilliard	Rainey	Welling
Cox	Holland	Raker	Welty
Crisp	Houston	Rayburn	Whaley
Crosser	Howard	Romjue	White, Ohio
Dale, N. Y.	Hull, Tenn.	Rouse	Wilson, La.
Delaney	Igoe	Rubey	Wilson, Tex.
Dent	Jacaway	Rucker	Wingo
Denton	Johnson, Ky.	Russell	Wise
Dewalt	Jones, Tex.	Sabath	Wright
Dickinson	Keating	Sanders, La.	Young, Tex.

NAYS—175.

Anderson	Chandler, Okla.	Dyer	Garland
Anthony	Clark, Pa.	Edmonds	Gillett
Austin	Classon	Elliott	Glynn
Bacharach	Cooper, W. Va.	Ellsworth	Goodall
Baer	Cooper, Wis.	Elston	Gould
Bland	Crago	Emerson	Graham, Ill.
Bowers	Cramton	Esch	Gray, N. J.
Britten	Currle, Mich.	Fairfield	Green, Iowa
Browne	Curry, Cal.	Farr	Greene, Mass.
Browning	Dale, Vt.	Focht	Greene, Vt.
Burroughs	Dallinger	Fordney	Griest
Butler	Darrow	Francis	Hadley
Caldwell	Davidson	Frear	Hamilton, Mich.
Campbell, Kans.	Davis	Freeman	Haskell
Cannon	Dempsey	French	Haugen
Carter, Mass.	Denison	Fuller, Ill.	Hawley
Cary	Dillon	Fuller, Mass.	Hayes

Hersey	McFadden	Pratt	Stiness
Hull, Iowa	McKenzie	Purnell	Strong
Humphreys	McKinley	Ramseyer	Sweet
Husted	McLaughlin, Mich.	Randall	Swift
Hutchinson	McLaughlin, Pa.	Rankin	Switzer
Ireland	Madden	Reavis	Tilson
Johnson, Wash.	Magee	Reed	Timberlake
Kahn	Mapes	Robbins	Tinkham
Kearns	Mason	Roberts	Treadway
Kelley, Mich.	Meeker	Rodenberg	Vestal
Kennedy, Iowa	Merritt	Rogers	Voigt
Kennedy, R. I.	Miller, Minn.	Rowe	Volstead
Kiess, Pa.	Mondell	Sanders, Ind.	Waldow
King	Moore, Pa.	Sanford	Walsh
Kinkaid	Moore, Ind.	Schall	Ward
Knutson	Morgan	Scott, Mich.	Wason
Kraus	Morin	Sells	Watson, Pa.
La Follette	Mott	Siegel	Wheeler
Langley	Mudd	Sinnott	White, Me.
Lehbach	Nelson	Slemp	Williams
Lenroot	Nichols, Mich.	Sloan	Wilson, Ill.
Little	Noian	Smith, Idaho	Winslow
Longworth	Osborne	Smith, Mich.	Woods, Iowa
Lufkin	Paige	Snell	Woodyard
Lundeen	Parker, N. J.	Stafford	Young, N. Dak.
McArthur	Peters	Steenerson	Zihlman
McCormick	Platt	Sterling, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Sears	Tague
-------	-------

NOT VOTING—82.

Borland	Gallagher	Kettner	Ramsey
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallivan	Key, Ohio	Riordan
Carew	Gandy	Kreider	Robinson
Chandler, N. Y.	Glass	LaGuardia	Rose
Coady	Godwin, N. C.	Larsen	Rowland
Cooper, Ohio	Good	Lobeck	Sanders, N. Y.
Copley	Graham, Pa.	London	Scott, Iowa
Costello	Hamilton, N. Y.	McAndrews	Scott, Pa.
Decker	Harrison, Miss.	McClintic	Smith, T. F.
Donovan	Heaton	McCulloch	Snyder
Dowell	Hefflin	McLemore	Stephens, Nebr.
Drukker	Heintz	Mann	Talbot
Dunn	Hensley	Miller, Wash.	Taylor, Colo.
Eagan	Hicks	Moon	Temple
Estopinal	Hollingsworth	Neely	Templeton
Fairchild, B. L.	Hood	Norton	Towner
Fairchild, G. W.	Huddleston	O'Shaunessy	Van Dyke
Fess	James	Parker, N. Y.	Vare
Flood	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polk	Wood, Ind.
Flynn	Jones, Va.	Porter	
Foss	Juul	Powers	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

The Clerk announced following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GLASS with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. LARSEN with Mr. LA GUARDIA.

Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. McANDREWS with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. SCOTT of Iowa.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

Mr. GILLET. Well, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. WELLING. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman says he was in the Hall listening.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, am I recognized for one hour?

The SPEAKER. Of course, if the gentleman wants an hour.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I ask for recognition in support of the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman. The Chair desires to make a suggestion to Members of the House. When a gentleman simply stands up here and stands still, the Chair can not tell what he is up for, even if he sees him; and it is nothing but fair for a gentleman, if he has a motion to make or anything to say, to address the Chair so the Chair can hear. In the next place, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FULLER] wanted to change his vote from "aye" to "no" a while ago.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts. From "present."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought he was one of those who came in here after the double call was over and asked to be recorded as present. The Chair thinks when a Member votes on a regular roll call "present" for any reason he is doing it because he has got a pair, and if he wants to change his vote he has got a perfect right to do it. Now, the only reason the Chair allows these stragglers who come in after the double roll call even to be recorded "present" is because he has a right to

count them as present. The rule may be very narrow, but that is it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. How will the name of my colleague [Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts] appear on the recorded vote?

The SPEAKER. It ought to appear the way he wants it. That would not change the result if he did.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Chair will not decide the question of the right of a Member to change his vote, made only after a recapitulation has been had. I submit to the Chair that the proper practice is that while a Member may change his vote at any time up to the announcement—

The SPEAKER. The final announcement.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, the final announcement; but the final announcement is made when such an announcement has been made as to permit a recapitulation to be in order. Now, the only purpose of the recapitulation is to correct errors, and if it can be made the medium for a change of votes without regard to an error of recording, you are practically opening up by a demand for a recapitulation the entire question, and I submit, aside from this controversy, that the better practice is to hold that after a recapitulation has been demanded it is not in order to change a vote except for error.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, may I say a word on that point?

The SPEAKER. There is no point before the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to make this suggestion, with the indulgence of the Speaker and the House. It seems to me that the rule as stated by the Speaker—that is, that changes can be made at any time before the final announcement of the vote—is correct, and its correctness shown by the result to-day for this reason: It was first announced that the motion to lay on the table was carried, and the final announcement after recapitulation was that it was lost; hence the first was not the final announcement of the vote, but the final announcement was made after the recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. No; if it was announced finally that it was carried or lost it was too late then for a change of vote. The practice is extremely narrow. Now, here is what happened, as the Chair recollects it. Of course, the Chair's recollection may not be better than anyone else's: The Chair announced 166 ayes, 166 noes, and the number present, and then he announced he voted himself, and before the Chair announced that motion was lost or carried, whichever it was, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] demanded a recapitulation. But now, if he had waited half a minute later a vote could not have been changed on recapitulation. The Chair has no sort of objection to the House itself making a rule on that; but, according to the rule that has been made, the Chair ruled right.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. WEBB. I ask to take up Senate 383—

The SPEAKER. Not now. The gentleman from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. WEBB. With his consent, Mr. Speaker, it is a very important matter.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is willing—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to yield the floor for that purpose, providing I will not lose my right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will see to it that the gentleman loses no rights.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENT. On yesterday the House agreed to take up what is called the quota bill, Senate joint resolution 123, after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. That is true, but it was to be taken up after the Journal was read and after business on the Speaker's table was disposed of. Well, the first thing that happened this letter from Postmaster General Burleson was on the Speaker's table, technically at least, and that was read to the House and then this parliamentary proceeding and row took place. As soon as we get through with that the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts. I would like to inquire how I am recorded on this vote.

The SPEAKER. Recorded as "present," the Chair thinks.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, that is not a parliamentary inquiry; that is past long, long ago, and the gentleman could find out—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can find out how he is recorded by coming to the Speaker, and we will take up the matter later. Now, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, the Senate this morning rejected the conference report on the bill S. 383, known as the sabotage bill. They have sent that bill back to the House and ask for a further conference.

I therefore ask that the House agree to a further conference, but insist on the House amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conference report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the bill (S. 383) to punish the destruction or injuring of war material and war transportation facilities by fire, explosives, or other violent means, and to forbid hostile use of property during time of war, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] asks unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to that bill and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the request is that they go into conference. If we do not go into conference, as this amendment is the only thing involved, does not that give us the status of standing by the original decision?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know what the report of the conferees is. The Chair knows what the request of the gentleman from North Carolina is. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. WEBB, Mr. CARLIN and Mr. VOLSTEAD.

MAIL SERVICE ABROAD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take very much time myself. I desire, however, that the membership of the House understand the motion I have made and my reason for making it. This is a motion to refer the communication from the Postmaster General's office, which has been read in the hearing of the House, to a committee of five men, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, to determine whether or not certain language contained in that communication is objectionable language to be sent in an official communication to the House of Representatives in response to the passage of a resolution asking for information. And as certain of the Members have come in since the original reading of the communication, I will, with the indulgence of the House, reread that part which has attracted our attention and meets with our objection. It is as follows, and I ask the membership of the House to observe the peculiar phraseology in which the gentleman sees fit so generously to indulge when he is speaking of one of the most reputable Members of the House of Representatives:

When Mr. TREADWAY stated in the House that he was "reliably informed that there has been a very large amount of that class of mail matter sent over," and "it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter have been placed in their hands overseas," he made assertion the absolute baselessness of which could have been ascertained by a telephone inquiry.

The resolution that asked for a reply, sending information from the Post Office Department to the House, contained no reference whatever to Mr. TREADWAY, no reference to any remarks he had made upon the floor of the House, but was confined absolutely to a request that the Postmaster General furnish the House with certain information in order that the House might be advised so as intelligently to act on a matter pending here. In order that the Postmaster General, apparently, might become equipped with the information desired, he asked the chairman of the Committee on Public Information, Mr. Creel, to inform him what matter, if any, of a certain character mentioned in the resolution was then being sent to France. Mr. Creel writes this letter, and in that he goes out of his way gratuitously to mention a Member of the House and the work he is doing in this House in a manner that is both flippant, disrespectful, and defiant.

Now, I have no criticism whatever of Mr. Creel or anybody else in private conversation speaking of the Members of this House in any way they see fit, but when in response to a resolution passed by the House a public official will go out of his way to mention a Member not necessary to refer to at all and speak of him in a way that is slighting, that is flippant, that is objectionable from every standpoint, I think the language is objectionable, and if the Members of the House have a proper

respect for their dignity and the reputation of the House before the country they will insist that this language be cut out. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There is no reflection whatever upon the Postmaster General or his office in that part of my remarks that I have already presented, and I do not intend to present any contrary to these in that regard. It may be the Postmaster General felt it necessary to send here the full communication as he received it. I can readily see that had he cut out the sentence promptly there would have arisen the inquiry in the House, "What are the words cut out?" and "What right has the Postmaster General to cut certain things out of a communication and send the balance to the House?" And consequently he sends the whole thing.

And, gentlemen of the House, I submit, regardless on which side of the aisle you sit, is not this language such that you in your heart resent it as applied to a Member of this House? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] intimated a short time ago that there was some animus back of the motion. I beg to disabuse his mind entirely as to that. There is no animus of any character. There is no partisanship of any character. There is simply a desire on my part and I am sure on the part of the gentlemen who have voted in support of our contention to protect the dignity of the House and preserve us from these insinuating remarks, these belittling observations, that characterize this epistle.

Just observe that it is not alone the language that is used, but it is the setting around the language. "What right has the Member of Congress from Massachusetts to stand on the floor and criticize me or my work?" is apparent in every word that he uses. It is precisely a defiance toward the legislative branch of the Government for presuming in any regard to criticize the activities of a bureau of the Government. He says, "He made assertions the absolute baselessness of which could have been ascertained by a telephone inquiry." I would not use that language toward anyone on this earth for whom I had an atom of respect, or toward anyone on this earth from whom ever again I expected an atom of respect. If language could be found in the English tongue calculated to convey a biting, stinging, belittling rebuke to Congress and its membership, it is this. I believe this vote we are about to take will, in a measure, express our opinion as to whether the House, as a part of the Congress, deems itself a body of sufficient dignity, sufficient honor and respectability, to be immune from an insulting communication like this, which comes from a subordinate individual in a bureau capacity. And that is all there is to it.

So I ask gentlemen on both sides of the aisle not to confuse the issue or the motion, but to express their opinion as to whether this language is fit officially to be transmitted to the House of Representatives. The motion I have made is the usual and ordinary one, and I hope it will be passed unanimously without a roll call. The Speaker of the House will appoint the committee, and the majority of them will doubtless be members of the Democratic Party. We do not care for that. The Members on the Democratic side of the House must be, and I know they are, as jealous of the reputation and the dignity and the prerogatives of this House as the Members of any party that ever sat in it, and I call upon you to-day to manifest that spirit which I feel confident you possess. [Applause.]

I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on the day before yesterday shortly after I had concluded a few remarks conveying an expression of my opinion, couched in very temperate language, of a speech made the day before by a gentleman who has again become the subject of discussion here, Mr. Creel, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], whom I see in the Chamber, rose in the defense of Mr. Creel, and he made the best he could out of a rotten case, I will say. [Laughter.] His first sentence was as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that on a serious occasion like the present, when bills are being considered which have for their object the creation of efficient armies, the observing of our treaties, the execution in the future of our undertakings, of our contracts with other nations, that a Member of this House—

Meaning myself—

finds it necessary to indulge for partisan purposes in a criticism of an official of this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that if any Member of my party, either here or elsewhere, undertakes the slightest criticism of any action of any official of this administration he is invariably accused of doing it for partisan purposes. Mr.

Speaker, if my criticism of Mr. Creel involved Republican partisanship, then the criticism of him by the New York Times this morning also involves Republican partisanship. And yet as every man here is well aware, the New York Times is perhaps the leading Democratic newspaper of this country; and if not, it is at least the most prominent supporter of all the policies of the present administration. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read an editorial appearing in this morning's New York Times, headed "Mr. Creel."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read it. The Clerk read as follows:

MR. CREEL.

Actual or inferential responsibility for the doings and utterances of Mr. George Creel can not any longer, consistently with the public welfare and comfort, be borne by the administration. It is the general impression that when he speaks he speaks for the President, an impression he has not very energetically sought to dispel. His declaration that he should be proud to his dying day "that there was no rush of preparation in this country prior to the day the President went before Congress" could not have been made at a more inopportune time; but that is not the worst of it. It is an avowal never to be made by anybody at any time. It has aroused public indignation to a degree which is only faintly reflected by the denunciation directed against it in Congress.

The usefulness of the Bureau of Public Information has never been satisfactorily demonstrated, but the demonstration that, if the bureau is to be continued, it should have a new head is complete and conclusive.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman give me about three minutes?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I yield three minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is any gentleman going to rise and say that that is a Republican partisan statement?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. Are you serious in the statement you make that it is a Democratic newspaper?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why, certainly. Does the gentleman deny it?

Mr. AYRES. Why, certainly. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. I might respond by asking the gentleman by what authority he speaks on that subject, but I am not interested, because it is so patently absurd. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times says precisely what I did, that if this administration does not believe as Mr. Creel says he does, that it is a matter of boast that this country went into this war inadequately prepared, and that it intends to see to it that after the war is over we are to be at once reduced to a condition of impotence to enforce an enduring and just peace, then Mr. Creel must resign, or he must be removed at once. I said that yesterday. It is repeated to-day in exact phraseology, nearly, by the New York Times.

My great hope, Mr. Speaker, is that when this motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] shall pass, and a committee will find that that language is insulting to a Member of the House and inimical to the privileges of this House, that of the Bureau of Public Information, to which this matter will be rereferred, its present chairman, Mr. Creel, will no longer be a member. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, if I have any apologies to make to this House or to anybody for the opinion that I enunciated about this man who the day before yesterday insulted the patriotism of the American people and to-day insults the American Congress, it is that my language was far too temperate. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is—

Mr. HARDY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. HARDY. To reply to the last remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has the floor for an hour.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to ask for five minutes if there is nobody representing this side.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am not completely familiar with the entire course and argument of the gentleman from Ohio, who poses before us as a nonpartisan advocate of great policies of the Government, but I want to say just this much about the Creel speech to which he took exception the other day and to which he repeats his exception to-day. The substance of it was

that Mr. Creel, in a speech before the conference of American lecturers here in Washington presented with great force the efforts that the United States had been making to meet her enemy since we entered into the war, so much so that the papers say he received round after round of applause from the delegates. The opening sentence of that speech as given declared that he was proud of the fact that before we entered into the war we had been inadequately prepared for war. That was the sentence the gentleman seized on. He did not read what else he said. Mr. Creel continued: "Because," he said, "that demonstrated the sincerity of our profession that this great Nation was a Nation devoted to peace."

And then he showed the magnificent conduct of our people since we entered the war.

He may have been unfortunate in the first words he used, in that he gave a handle to men for political purposes to attack him. But the man that is not proud of the fact that when this war began America was not ready and armed as Germany was must be ashamed of the record of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, which for all these years left this country in that condition. We boasted that our justice and humanity to all men and all nations was our shield and buckler of defense; that we were opposed to great standing armies in time of peace. We boasted we were a Nation devoted to peace. We boasted we were a Nation opposed to great preparation for aggressive warfare, and the man who simply refers to that fact and says he was proud that our life was consistent as a Nation has not insulted the American people. [Applause.] It is, indeed, strange that the great audience who heard the whole speech gave it rounds of applause if it was the craven and traitorous speech the gentleman would have you believe it was, by reading a single sentence, and the man who now uses that expression as a weapon with which to attack Mr. Creel or the party of which Mr. Creel is an humble representative and separates it from the context of the whole speech in order to do so is going out of his way to make political capital in a small way and to challenge an expression which would have found utterance in many a throat before we became involved in this war, and which was consonant with the life of the Nation up to the time we became involved in it. It seems to me that these little, petty, partisan flings are in line with other utterances that I have heard the gentleman from Ohio in the last three weeks indulge in, which have been full of party flings. He is always prating of his non-partisanship and patriotism, of his moderation, and support of the administration, yet he lets no opportunity pass to attack every measure and every man of the administration where attack might seem to give some party advantage. He seized onto this just one sentence out of a whole speech as a sweet morsel of political claptrap to roll under his tongue. Not content with the discussion of the issues that come before us, every occasion that can give a pretext for criticism brings him to his feet. He talks about temperateness. I have seen him with flashing eye and with quivering cheek indulging in the same practice heretofore, so that I gaze on him with amazement and wonder why! [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I regret extremely that I was the originator of a matter which has occupied the time of the House for over two hours, when there is extremely important business pending. I introduced a resolution of inquiry which waited one week for action by the Post Office Committee, and no response was received to it. Under the rules of the House, at the expiration of the week, the resolution was called up and adopted. I made no personal references. That goes without saying. A Member could not make any personal references in such a resolution as that; and my object in asking for information on the subject covered was as sincere a motive as ever influenced a Member of this House in any action he might take. A day or two previously the announcement was made that parcels to soldiers overseas, sent by their friends and relatives, could no longer be received by the Post Office Department for transmission to them unless perchance the individual soldier to whom the package was going, sent from overseas, approved by his commanding officer, a request for the contents of that package, and that that individual approval was included in the package when offered for mailing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coupled with the request for information as to the quantity being so transported was a further request for information as to the amount of matter being sent by the Committee on Public Information, the so-called Creel Bureau. I think in that connection I might say that it was a matter of very little interest to me as to what quantity might be going, or whether there was any going at all or not. But I did receive

reliable information, which I can submit at any time, that such literature was being sent over. Now, I submit to this House, which is of the more interest to the boys in the trenches, to receive these little home packages, from mother, sister, wife, or sweetheart, or a speech by such a great man as we recognize the Secretary of the Treasury to be? My interest in the resolution that I offered was to find out whether that class of literature was still being sent across, and the package from home to the soldier boy was being refused.

In connection with the adoption of the resolution I made some remarks on this floor, and Mr. Creel has seen fit to reply to those remarks in the letter submitted by the Postmaster General, in such a way that I feel I am justified in asking this House to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. I do not need to offer any more explanation than he has so well offered. I have no personal grievance with Mr. Creel. I never saw the man in my life. I have a little enmity to him now, and any other man would have when he dignifies his position in a letter of absolute insult to a Member of this House for remarks made by the Member on the floor of this House in his right and says that the statement the Member makes is founded on "absolute baselessness." I have heard men called liars in various phrases, but I would much prefer that a man would come right outside the door here and call me a liar to my face now [applause] than write such an insinuating letter as that and submit it through such an instrumentality as a communication from the Postmaster General.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] says the remark of Mr. Creel was insulting, and I feel that it was insulting. Further, Mr. Creel questions a statement in my right as a Member of this House when he so characterizes my remarks. I leave the House to its own decision as to whether or not a public official, in answering a resolution of inquiry adopted by this House, can take that means of offering a personal insult to a Member of this House. I myself am now no longer concerned in this matter. It seems to me it is up to the House itself to say whether it cares to have a public official use his prerogative of letter writing to the extent of submitting an official response to a resolution adopted by the House, asking for information purely and nothing else, and including in his reply a personal insult for such remarks as the Member introducing it had the right to make on the floor. Mr. Creel quotes the statement that I say I had been reliably informed that there had been a large amount of that class of mail matter sent over. It is absolutely true. I have been so informed.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is that the only thing to which the letter is directed?

Mr. TREADWAY. And then he goes still further. I have not the exact phraseology. I do not know exactly the words, but I take it for granted that he is correct in saying it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter have been placed in their hands overseas, practically confirming the same language. That is the extent of his quotation, which Mr. Creel says is "absolute baselessness." And, further than that, Mr. Speaker, he says I could have found out that it was absolutely baseless by a telephone inquiry. May I ask this House, when have we reached the point when a Member of Congress in order to secure information is under obligation to the subordinates of a department to call them on the telephone? Of course, if I had called for Mr. Creel I would have been shifted a dozen times, in the various offices down there, through a line of clerks, and I would have been blamed lucky if I could have reached Mr. Creel at all; because I see that just now he is devoting a good deal of his time and attention to going up in aeroplanes. He had one ride here the other day, and I saw that he got a little hurt over in Baltimore repeating it. So that it would have been a little difficult, probably, about the time this resolution was up, to have found Mr. Creel, to get him to answer the inquiry that I wanted to make. I was within my rights in asking for the information referred to in the resolution. I am still within my rights in confirming that statement, and I am still further within my rights when I say that a subordinate of a department of the Government has no right to offer a personal insult, and to question the veracity of a Member of this House for such statements as he makes on the floor of this House.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TREADWAY. My time has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET]. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to state that I am surprised at the attitude taken by most of the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber. This day was set apart for very

important business. Then this matter came up suddenly. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] made his motion. A motion was made to lay that on the table and it was defeated, and then the gentleman from Minnesota changed his original motion—the objection to which on that side perhaps I could understand—and said that he simply wished to have the matter referred to a committee, and to have the matter investigated and reported upon. Why gentlemen upon that side of the House should with such unanimity have refused to allow a committee to be appointed by their own Speaker, whose impartiality is trusted by both sides of the House, which is all we asked, to investigate this matter and to report upon it, and why they should wish to take up two hours and a half in opposing that is beyond my comprehension. It seems to me that that was a most fair and moderate proposition. Some gentlemen on this side of the House thought it was unduly moderate and leaned backward—

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman see any fact in controversy; any question to be investigated?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly; it is in controversy whether that was a proper statement or not.

Mr. HARDY. That is a question of opinion and not of fact.

Mr. GILLETT. It is a question on which the gentleman from Minnesota very temperately and wisely said, "I will not ask the House to pass sudden judgment on that; I will give it time to get a report from the committee."

Mr. HARDY. Then the motion should have been postponed, it seems to me, to a future day and let us think about it.

Mr. GILLETT. If you want to think whether you will let the committee think about it, I do not think we will let it be done. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion and all amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota to appoint a committee of five.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as the committee Mr. CARAWAY, Mr. HUMPHREYS, Mr. BOOHER, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MADDEN, and the document from the Postmaster General is temporarily referred to this committee of five.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 8753. An act to amend section 3, title 1, of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917.

LIABILITY TO MILITARY SERVICE OF CERTAIN REGISTERED PERSONS.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], I desire to call up Senate joint resolution 123.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Resolved, etc. That if under any regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," are placed in classes for the purpose of determining their relative liability for military service, no provision of said act shall prevent the President from calling for immediate military service under regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President all or part of the persons in any class or classes except those exempt from draft under the provisions of said act, in proportion to the total number of persons placed in such class or classes in the various subdivisions of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the terms of said act, or from calling into immediate military service persons classed as skilled experts in industry or agriculture, however classified or wherever residing.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are four hours of general debate on this resolution. I ask unanimous consent that one-half of that time be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] and the other half by myself.

Mr. GILLETT. Reserving the right to object, has that been agreed to by the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]?

Mr. FIELDS. That has been agreed to by the ranking minority member.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] and one-half by himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution, S. J. Res. No. 123, provides that no provision of the act of May 18, 1917 (known as the selective-service act), shall prevent the President from calling for immediate military service under regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President all or part of the persons in any class or classes except those exempt from draft under the provisions of said act, in proportion to the total number of persons placed in such class or classes in the various subdivisions of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the terms of said act, or from calling into immediate military service persons classed as skilled experts in industry or agriculture, however classified or wherever residing.

I will state in the outset, Mr. Speaker, that under the selective-service act of May 18, 1917, or the regulations prescribed by the President in pursuance of said act, each registrant was given an order number, and the right of the President or the military authorities to defer the call of a registrant when his name is reached, who is not otherwise entitled to statutory exemption, is seriously questioned by high legal authority, and if it be true that the call of registrants can not be legally deferred when their order number is reached it will be impossible for the War Department to carry into execution its latest plan of classification under the questionnaire system, under which registrants having dependents are given deferred classification, or to defer the call of registrants in class 1 who are assiduously engaged in planting, cultivating, or harvesting crops, which the President desires to do. From my viewpoint the dictates of humanity demand that the call of registrants who have wives and children or other dependent relatives be deferred so long as there are available registrants who are unattached and who have no dependents, and the growing scarcity of food products, the supply of which depends upon farm labor makes it of national and international importance to conserve farm labor. Therefore, if there was no other points of merit in the bill, these two points are of such importance as to not only warrant, but to demand its speedy enactment into law. But there are other important features in the bill worthy of your consideration, one of which is to cure an inconsistency in the selective-service law. The law as enacted places the burden of military service upon the citizen population but provides that the whole population shall be used in ascertaining the quota of the various States and subdivisions thereof. The department, of course, took the latest census—1910—as a basis on which to ascertain the total population, and in administering the law in the first call under the selective draft it was found that that method placed great hardships upon many sections of the country for various reasons. First, local conditions have changed since 1910. There has been a great influx of population into some centers, and other sections of the country did not have as much population in 1917 as they had in 1910. Therefore, estimating it upon the 1910 census, or taking for the basis of its estimate the 1910 census, must necessarily result in inequalities.

There is another feature that enters into it. In the cities and some sections of the country we have a large foreign population. That foreign population is not subject to the draft, but it was used in ascertaining the quota from those communities. In those instances the people suffered. That hardship, however, has been or is being largely obviated by our recent treaties with our cobelligerents. So, in order to get away from these inequities, the passage of this resolution is deemed advisable by the War Department.

In the administration of the draft law, under the first draft there were, if I remember correctly, two classes of registrants—the exempt and the nonexempt. Discretion was lodged largely in the local board as to who should be exempt and who should not, and we see in the administration of the law by these boards most glaring differences in classification, even in contiguous territories. In many sections some local board failed or refused to grant any claim for exemption, while others would go as high as 40 or 50 per cent, and in one case 74 per cent. So, in order to get away from that condition the War Department worked out a new classification, classifying the registrants into five classes, beginning with class 1 under what is known as the questionnaire system, which is considered by all who are familiar with

the subject to be an improvement over the first system of classification.

Now, of course there will be some inequities between local boards in the classification under this new system. It would be impossible to work out a classification system for a great country of 100,000,000 people that would apply exactly alike to each and every community. But the figures from the War Department show that the inequalities are far less under the new classification than under the method used in the call of the first increment under the selective draft. And the War Department has said that the passage of this resolution is absolutely necessary to carry out the new classification to which I have referred. Then there is another proposition embodied in this resolution, and it is the one that appeals to me most.

The resolution authorizes the President to call any part or all of any one of the classes. The purpose of that is to authorize the President to lay the burdens of military service upon the men in class 1 first. There seems to be a difference of opinion among members of the committee as to the intention of Congress when we passed the selective-service law. Members of the minority who have joined in the minority report, or some of them, are of the opinion that a man's liability to service should be determined solely and exclusively by the number that he drew in the drawing, and I agree that it should be, so far as it applies to the class to which he belongs, but I was of the opinion, and I am of the opinion now, that it is better for all concerned that the men who have the least responsibilities at home, the men who have no dependents, the men who are not so vital in the industrial and social life of the country, to first answer their country's call. In other words, I believe that it is better, and I believe it is right and proper, to call a single man who has no wife and children before you call the man who has a wife and children or other dependent relatives. That was my idea when we were enacting the selective-service law. If this resolution is adopted as reported by the committee, it gives the President authority to exhaust all of class 1 in all sections of the country before he invades the other class in any part of the country. I know that there is some argument on the other side of this proposition, but our arguments rest upon our viewpoints. If we hold local interests above national interests, of course the argument that this arrangement is unjust might hold good in some localities, but if we hold that this is the war of the Nation and that the best interest of the Nation should be paramount in the mind of every man, we must concede that that method is the best that will least injure or disturb the citizenship of the Nation and place the least hardship upon the dependent women and children.

Other Members of the House may judge as they like, but it is my opinion that we will least disturb even local conditions by calling into the service men in class 1, so long as that class exists throughout the country, rather than invade the other classes in some sections, thereby taking fathers from their children, husbands from their wives, or sons from their dependent parents. There will be an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER], and inasmuch as there is a great demand for time and I may not have an opportunity to speak later on I desire to refer to that amendment now. It is an amendment to base the apportionment upon the total registered population. If I understand that proposition, when a community furnishes all of the registrants that it has in class 1, but has not filled its quota, it must then draw from the other classes, hereby invading the class that has dependents. To that part of the amendment I am absolutely opposed.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I ask the gentleman if that is a committee amendment that the gentleman is speaking of?

Mr. FIELDS. The amendment was not offered or discussed in the committee. It has been prepared by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] since the bill was reported. It will be offered as an amendment on the floor. I hope that no amendment will be adopted which will make it possible in the future administration of this law to call into the military service men who have wives and children or dependent parents to support while there are other available men in the country who have no dependents, regardless of where they may be located. This war is not a sectional question; it is the biggest problem that this country has ever faced, and it is the Nation's problem, and I hope that every man here and elsewhere will view it from a national viewpoint. There will be another amendment offered, that will provide that credit shall be given for the numbers that have volunteered in the service from time to time. Credits have already been given for those who have previously volunteered, and as there is but little volunteering at this time it will mean but little either way whether that

amendment is adopted or defeated. I am somewhat like the new squire on that proposition—there is a good argument on both sides; but one is evidently better than the other.

If a local community contends that it should have credit for the men who shall volunteer from that community, I see no reason why it should not, unless the calculations necessary to ascertain the credits due it would impede the progress of the draft when the call shall come; but if that should occur, or if it is the belief of the War Department that it will occur, shall we impede the progress of the War Department by forcing it to delay the call sufficient time to figure out and properly place the credits due each community at a time like this when our country is facing the greatest crisis in its history; and, Mr. Speaker, there is another thought worthy of consideration, which is, for what purpose did those volunteers give their service to the country? Did they volunteer for the benefit of the country or did they volunteer for the benefit of other registrants whose call would be deferred because of their voluntary enlistment? I maintain that every man who volunteered into the military service of his country volunteered not for the benefit of his neighbor registrant, but for the benefit of his country, for the preservation of the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.] So I say if crediting these voluntary enlistments will impede the progress of the draft and the prosecution of the war, then the country for whom these men volunteered should be given the benefit of their voluntary enlistment. As I have previously said, credits have already been given for those who have previously volunteered. That question was raised in committee by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIDSON] by a question propounded by him to Gen. Crowder. Mr. DAVIDSON said:

To illustrate: My home city was very greatly interested in the National Guard and sent out very full companies—there were three companies from my home city. The result was that in the first draft not a single man was drafted, and the boys writing to me report that there are enough volunteers to fill the next draft. If enough boys volunteered from my home city—the city of Oshkosh—to not only fill the first draft but to fill their quota in the second draft, how can I explain to them that in addition to that they are going to draft men from that city?

Gen. CROWDER. I have tried to cover that situation before. The officer who has done a large amount of the figuring on the quotas is here, and I am going to ask you to let him have a try at it in new language.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I want to understand it myself. I believe there is much merit in your plan.

Col. JOHNSON. Let us suppose that Oshkosh started out with 100 men liable to military service. Fifty of them volunteered in National Guard or Regular Army, and now we come in with the new rule. Oshkosh, instead of having 100 men in class 1, only has 50. The new quota for Oshkosh will be based on 50 instead of 100, and thus Oshkosh automatically gets credit for all the men of Oshkosh who volunteered with the National Guard and Regular Army.

There is another thought in connection with giving credit for voluntary enlistments that we might well consider. I am told that in some sections of the country practically all men who are in sympathy with the war movement have volunteered. I do not know whether that is correct or not. That is a pretty broad statement, and I do not attempt to vouch for its accuracy, but I was told a few days ago by a Member of this House that he had been in a section of the country where that condition exists. If that be true, and we give credit for voluntary enlistments, this is what will happen in sections like that: These men who have not volunteered and who are charged with not being in sympathy with this war movement will remain at home largely because of the fact that their neighbors have volunteered for service.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? What sort of a soldier does the gentleman believe these disloyal men would make?

Mr. FIELDS. I did not say they were disloyal.

Mr. REAVIS. What sort of a soldier does the gentleman think a man who is not in sympathy with the purposes of his country would make?

Mr. FIELDS. I think a man who is in sympathy with the purposes of his country would be a better soldier than the man who is not.

Mr. REAVIS. Would it not be a good idea to give these fellows some employment and keep them out of the Army?

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman is getting back to the volunteer proposition, which is past, and I do not care to open up that discussion. Mr. Speaker, there is one more provision in the bill—

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. FIELDS. Let me finish this statement. The last provision of the bill provides for the calling of men who have been given deferred classification, in class 2, as skilled workmen regardless of their classification or location. The Military Establishment may from time to time be in great need of skilled mechanics, and this provision of the resolution makes it pos-

sible for it to call these men regardless of their classification or their location. I think that a very valuable feature of the resolution. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman is quite familiar, I know, with the provisions of this resolution, and I am asking the question for information purely. My understanding is that if this resolution prevails the first call to be responded to will be those of class 1.

Mr. FIELDS. Exactly.

Mr. HAMLIN. Suppose there is to be a million men raised on the first call. Will that million of men be apportioned among the different States in class 1 according to the number of men in those different States in class 1? That is the way I understand it.

Mr. FIELDS. They will.

Mr. HAMLIN. Now, this question: This classification is submitted by different boards in the different States, and there are no hard and fast rules by which this classification should be made by those boards. Does the gentleman concede that this thing might happen, that a board in one State or one section of a State might put very few men, in proportion to the population of that State, in class 1, and if the call comes exclusively to class 1 and it is taken according to the population in class 1, without regard to the population of the State, the gentleman's State, for instance, might have to give three times as many men to that first call as my State would, because the boards in my State might classify very few in No. 1? Does the gentleman anticipate some unfairness in that?

Mr. FIELDS. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. There is no hard and fast rule under which the classification is made, but there is a general rule laid down by the War Department, and the classifications, the records show, are much more uniform under the new classification than under the classification of the first draft. In fact, the range of variation of percentage between the classifications by the different boards is not nearly so wide under the new classification as under the old. As I stated in the start, of course, there will be some instances where there will be differences. I know of no way, owing to the different conditions that exist, or no rule that could be worked out that would cause men of the local boards to act in the same mind and under exactly the same decision in all cases; in fact, so long as there are men of different capacities there will be men of different opinions, even in matters of fact; but, speaking broadly, the figures show that the range of inequality is not nearly so wide under the new classification as under the old.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman has passed from the point I wanted to recur to, but the gentleman stated a moment ago in regard to the question whether the men who were really anxious to help in this war have enlisted voluntarily and several gentlemen got the impression that the gentleman was in doubt on that question. I do not think there is any doubt so far as our own State is concerned because I know of thousands who are ready and waiting to be called to the colors whenever the country needs them.

Mr. FIELDS. I should regret—

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not think the gentleman meant that.

Mr. FIELDS (continuing). If I was so understood. That was not what I meant to say at all, but what I meant to say was that every man who has volunteered was willing, but some are not, speaking of one section of the country—I shall not name the section, for the information given to me may not be correct—but a Member of the House has said that that condition exists in one section that he visited recently. If it does, I suppose, of course, that it is only a small section of the country, and the great mass of the registrants who are waiting to be called throughout the country are just as anxious to get in as the men who have volunteered.

Mr. LANGLEY. They are merely waiting until the country calls them to go. Let me suggest to my friend, the gentleman may be too modest to call attention to the fact that the gentleman is one who represents a district one county of which, Breathitt, at least, had more volunteers than the entire quota.

Mr. FIELDS. Fifty-two more volunteers than the quota, is my recollection.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I do.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to get a little information. The call has gone out for the raising or inducting into the service of 150,000 men under a call for a second draft army. I noticed in the Official Bulletin, and have also seen it stated in the press that the number that my State—Georgia—should furnish under

that call is about 6,300. I also noticed that the State of New York, with a great many times the number of population of Georgia, the great city of New York, having probably twice the population of the entire State of Georgia, is to furnish under this call only 10,000 and some odd hundreds. I would like to know on what basis or plan the quotas are called, under the old plan, or is it under the idea that this bill is to be enacted into law and the call based on the number of class 1?

Mr. FIELDS. I think it is fair to assume that the War Department is not calling men under the provisions of this bill on the assumption that it is going to pass. I am not familiar with the particular case that the gentleman cites and would therefore not attempt to explain it.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman, then, can not give me any information as to why that great disparity in the number?

Mr. FIELDS. With regard to that particular case, no; and not being familiar with it, it would not be fair to the War Department for me to attempt to answer it.

Mr. CRISP. The State had furnished its entire quota under the first call. This is under the second call. And their quota is about 6,300. And I notice that Indiana and other States with a population about as great have to furnish only three or four thousand men. I would like to know the basis for that.

Mr. FIELDS. I will say to the gentleman that these are only the remaining numbers of the first call, who have not until recently been summoned to camp. The second general call has not yet been made.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN], as I understand it, the scheme to raise this army is based very largely upon the idea of local responsibility and local control. Now, does not the gentleman anticipate that unless you change your machinery for raising this army you will remove from the several communities a strong incentive from everybody outside of class 1 in seeing that nobody that ought to be in class 1 escapes the responsibility which is incident to the position in class 1.

Mr. FIELDS. I will say to the gentleman I do not know where this removes the local machinery in any way. The local boards will continue to exist, and they will still classify the registrants.

Mr. SUMNERS. Directing attention to the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri, if you provide that these men are to be taken from all over the country, then in any community its local board can prevent its citizenship from getting into class 1—shields that community from its responsibility of helping to contribute this army.

Mr. FIELDS. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. There are some cases of that kind throughout the country; but the War Department carefully scans the figures, and in every case where upon the face of it there seems to have been some favoritism played an inspector has been sent into that community and the board has been ordered to make an investigation and reclassification.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. REAVIS. The question I had in mind was this: If there is partisanship on the part of the local board, so as to exempt those from class 1 who should have been placed in class 1, will not public sentiment in that community on the part of parents of boys who have been sent, while boys equally responsible for service are kept at home, compel those who are fraudulently exempted to go into the service eventually?

Mr. FIELDS. Certainly so.

Mr. SUMNERS. Does the gentleman think public opinion would be as strong in that direction if every man should stand just behind the lines in class 2 now, if that community did not furnish that quota out of class 2? Now, if that community did not furnish its quota out of class 1, he would be called on to help furnish the quota.

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman is drawing on his imagination very extravagantly. The War Department would not accept such a classification from any board without investigating it. And in addition to that, if this resolution passes, they have the right to draw on class 2 even before class 1 is exhausted, regardless of the order, number, or location of those in class 2.

Mr. HAMLIN. Right on that point. As I understand the resolution, it gives the right to the President to call from any class certain mechanics—

Mr. FIELDS. Experts, who, if classified as such, are placed in class 2.

Mr. HAMLIN. We all understand that is pretty broad authority.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The resolution gives him authority to call not only mechanics, but call any man in any class from any place at any time.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is exactly what I say. It is broad authority, and it looks to me like the President has the right to call anybody from any class.

Mr. LAZARO. Has the gentleman any idea of the percentage of the men who were registered in class 1 who have volunteered and been permitted to select their branch of the service away from the firing line?

Mr. FIELDS. I have not those figures at hand.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. If you will make your question brief.

Mr. KNUTSON. What provision is there in the bill to protect agricultural labor?

Mr. FIELDS. There is no provision in the bill. But the Provost Marshal General has said in a letter that he published to the country that he would place at the foot of class 1 or defer the call of every man who is engaged in planting, cultivating, or harvesting of a crop, and on March 11 he sent the following telegram to governors of all the States. The telegram reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, March 11, 1918.

Governors of all States:
(No. B-80.)

A new National and State quota will be announced as soon as Congress acts on pending legislation governing the apportionment of quotas. In the meantime it will be necessary to call a new increment of about 90,000 men to be distributed equally throughout the United States. The call for these men will go out later in the day. In several cases this call will run over the current quota of the State and boards upon which it is made, but the excess will be credited on the new quota of each State and board affected, as will all other excess due to special calls.

The situation arising from the scarcity of farm labor demands that the call to the colors of men actively, completely, and assiduously engaged in the planting or cultivation of a crop, but who are in class 1 and within the new quota, should be deferred until the end of the new quota. Please instruct your local boards, therefore, that the President directs that, in filling this emergency call, they shall pass the order numbers of such men and defer their call for the present. It must be borne in mind that this step is taken solely in the need of the Nation and not for the benefit of any individual. Therefore, while boards should consider it a grave duty to exercise this power to conserve and augment the agricultural production, they should observe closely the conduct of those deferred, and immediately upon becoming convinced that any person so deferred is not giving his entire time and earnest attention to agricultural duty or that he is trifling with the deferment thus granted him, the board should forthwith call him to the colors. All citizens should assist in making this expedient effective and in bringing to the attention of the boards cases meriting deferment as well as cases in which deferment is being abused.

CROWDER.

And I will add in this connection what I have previously said, that it is seriously questioned by eminent legal authority as to whether the War Department can execute this order or proceed under the new classification without the enactment of this legislation. Therefore, the War Department is extremely anxious that it be passed without delay.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to find out if the proposition is to base the quota of a State on the number of those in class 1 (A) or upon the number of all those who are ultimately liable to military duty? I see your report says:

First, to provide that quotas under the selective-service act shall be based upon the number actually liable to military service under said act instead of upon population of the several States.

Now, do you mean by that that those in class 1 (A) or those who would ultimately be liable to military service?

Mr. FIELDS. Of course, if the war continues until all men shall be called, it would mean all those liable to military service, but in the first call, which applies to class 1, it will be based upon the number in class 1. In other words, it will be based on the number in the class they are drawing from at the time.

Mr. STEVENSON. What is the justice of that? I want to know. I am trying to get information. Ought it not to be based on the entire population rather than on military service under this act?

Mr. FIELDS. If we do that, when a community has exhausted all of its men in class 1 and has not yet filled its quota it will be forced, as I have previously explained, to send men who have dependents to make up its quota.

Mr. STEVENSON. When they have sent all their men in class 1.

Mr. FIELDS. Yes; if a community sends all the men it has in class 1 before its quota is filled, it will have to draw from men in other classes according to their order numbers, unless this bill is enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. How much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. Thirty-six minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 36 minutes. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] is recognized for two hours.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, it has been charged that the fact that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs took time to consider this important bill has delayed the draft. Of course there is not one scintilla of foundation for any such claim as that. The Provost-Marshal General of the United States Army, under the law as it exists now, can call every man of military age in the United States and put him in the ranks to-morrow under the law we enacted heretofore. This new law that we ask for will not add a single man to the Army of the United States if it becomes a law. It only seeks to change the rules of the game after the game has begun, and some of us think it changes them unfairly between the different States and communities.

I have undertaken to put into the RECORD here the tremendous variation between counties and districts, running as low as 9 per cent in one county and as high in one county, in the district of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], as 98 per cent. I finally have gotten the Provost Marshal General to recognize it. Gen. Crowder is quoted as follows in the public press to-day:

Provost Marshal Gen. Crowder to-day ordered a thorough investigation of local draft board classifications in districts where the percentage of class 1 men is singularly small.

The inquiries are the result of congressional opposition to Crowder's plan to base the quotas for future drafts on the number in class 1 instead of the total number registered or the population.

In some districts the percentage of class 1 men is only 17, while in other districts it is 45 or 50. Several Congressmen claim that some local boards have deliberately adopted the policy of cutting down the percentage of class 1 men to keep their quotas lower.

"The investigations are being ordered just as rapidly as it is found there is the least cause for one," it was stated at the Provost Marshal General's office.

Now, if you will adopt the amendment that I am going to offer you will not have need of any investigations. There will not be anybody sent around to look into these matters, because we propose to base it, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] indicated, upon the total registered military population of military age in each district, and there can be no manipulation of that.

Now, in order that I may be exact in my statements, I want to read to you some provisions of the existing law, and the changes in that law made by the bill that we are considering. The very purpose of this bill is to hereafter take away the credit that was given in the previous draft for volunteers. It proposes that the drafted men shall be called in proportion to the total number of men placed in such class or classes or various subdivisions of the Territories and States and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the existing act, and that no provision in the act that we passed last May shall prevent him from doing that thing. The provision in existing law that would prevent him from calling the total number placed in class 1 provides that credit shall be given upon draft quotas for the men who volunteer or who are mustered into the service from the National Guard, and when we raised that point Mr. DAVIDSON, of Wisconsin, said to Gen. Crowder, "What shall we say to the people of Oshkosh, where we have not as yet drafted a man?" He said, "We have now many volunteers ready for the next call." Col. Johnson, the deputy provost marshal, said a man is not entitled to much credit who volunteers. He should let the provost marshal send for him when he wants him.

The existing law bases the quotas called for from the various draft divisions of the country upon the total population of the district. For the reason that the population statistics available at present are only estimates, the Provost Marshal General states that the quotas called for under the present law in the first draft were not equitably distributed. In determining the population aliens who are not liable for military service were counted in the estimates of population, and therefore those draft districts having large alien populations were required to furnish soldiers out of proportion to the numbers of those taken from districts whose total population was largely or entirely citizens.

We seek to correct those two things.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman made the statement that the draft was made upon the population of districts. Is it not based upon the population of States?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. On the population of States and subdivisions or districts thereof.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it says "the States."

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It says "States, Territories, and Districts, or subdivisions thereof." I have the law right here.

In order to eliminate these two inequities, which are generally admitted, the joint resolution S. J. Res. 123, which is now before us for consideration, was prepared by the office of the Provost Marshal General and submitted to Congress for its approval.

I have prepared an amendment to the bill under consideration which I propose to offer at the proper time, and which I have published in the Record at the end of my remarks for the information of the House, which will completely correct the above-enumerated inequities of the present law and yet preserve entirely the basic principle of all compulsory military laws of every country. [The basic reason urged for the draft law was that every man owes military service.]

The present law provides that the draft—
shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive. Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and subdivisions thereof, shall be determined in proportion to the population thereof.

My amendment provides that the quotas for each draft district shall be determined in proportion to the total number of persons registered and liable for military service therein, including resident aliens who have waived claims for exemption.

The reason for including aliens who have waived claims for exemption is because Gen. Crowder states that they have been placed in class 1, and therefore are as ready for military service as any citizen. The reason for abandoning total population as a basis is that it is a guess at present and includes aliens who can claim exemption. My amendment eliminates both of these objections and bases the quota upon a census made by the War Department itself, and eliminates all aliens who refuse to serve in the Army. [Applause.]

The Provost Marshal General's office by the adoption of the bill now under consideration without amendment proposes to change completely the basic principle of the present law and determine the quotas in proportion to the number of men placed in classes by the local draft boards. Gen. Crowder has stated to the Military Committee and to me personally in discussion about the bill that if this bill is adopted he expects to base the quotas hereafter to be called upon the total number of registrants placed in class 1 by the various draft boards of the country.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. DENISON. Under your amendment that you are going to propose is the quota determined before the physical examination or afterwards?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Before the physical examination. That does not leave any chances for manipulation. The bill as reported by the majority of the committee is intended to no longer allow credit for volunteers or those inducted voluntarily into the service.

In regard to that call for the first men under the second draft they sent out notices to the States saying that they were not to allow credit for volunteers. I addressed a letter to the Provost Marshal General and called attention to the provision of the present law. His office replied that they wanted to know that they would get a certain number of men at this call. He notified them not to take credit for volunteers, but he says he expects in the future to give credit for volunteers in subsequent quotas.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. If that credit is not allowed for the volunteers, how does it occur that discrepancies exist such as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] referred to?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It is because of the power the President has to call them for special units. We granted a greater power perhaps than Congress intended. We are told by the Judge Advocate General's office that they do not have to come to Congress for any further legislation on that score. We opened the door wide enough for anybody and everybody.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that the gentleman's amendment proposes to base the quota on the total registration?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. On those found liable to military service. I omit all aliens and all those excluded under the law between the ages of 21 and 30.

Mr. MADDEN. That excludes convicts and everybody?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; excludes convicts and immoral persons and aliens who have claimed their alienage. Those are included in class 5. My amendment only includes in

the military population those in the first four classes—all good Irishmen and other good men who are willing to fight for this country. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. The same inequalities that are complained about will hereafter exist as they exist to-day?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No. I have eliminated all of them. I have eliminated all chances of that. Now, we know what they are. I eliminated all aliens who claim exemption. Every alien who waived exemption is put in class 1.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. If I understand the gentleman correctly, if this bill is passed it will wipe the slate clean of all credits which the States or counties may have by reason of volunteer enlistments?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It will allow no credit for volunteers. No; they will have none whatever hereafter if you adopt the bill as reported by the committee. It is the intention of the War Department to allow no credit hereafter for volunteers upon future draft quotas if this bill becomes a law as reported to the House.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I should like to finish my speech if I can, and then I will answer questions.

Mr. FIELDS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that all aliens who do not claim exemption are placed in class 1?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. If the gentleman will recall, I asked Gen. Crowder that question in the committee, and he said they were giving the same rights to aliens on claims for exemption as to any others.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; but he says directly, and I will put his language in the Record, that every alien who did not claim his exemption is placed in class 1, and he said it to me in the presence of the Assistant Secretary of War. There is no question about it. Now I will yield for one more question, and then I want to go on.

Mr. KREIDER. I should like to know whether the gentleman's amendment provides for the giving of credit for those who have enlisted since the last draft?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; for all volunteers. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Do I understand the gentleman from Nebraska to say that hereafter the Government will not accept volunteers?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It will accept them, but hereafter no credit will be allowed, if this bill becomes a law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Allowing no credit is a very different thing from not receiving them.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They will receive them, but they will not allow your district any credit for it. I am going to show you what that means.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They will allow men to volunteer to go and fight for the country—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; but they will allow no credit to your district for them.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. To take the place of drafted men—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But give them no credit for them. Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As a matter of fact, the Provost Marshal's office ceased giving credit some time ago, did it not?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will allow me, I think there is some misunderstanding about this question of volunteering.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. All right.

Mr. DENT. The Government has stopped receiving volunteers, except in the Navy and in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They volunteer for service in the Engineers.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will explain that, if the House will permit me. After the 15th of December they changed the name for the man who wants to serve his country voluntarily. They no longer call him a volunteer, but if he comes within the draft age he is called an inducted man, and under the present law that man's draft district would be entitled to credit for him.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Will the gentleman state this fact, that this bill not only denies credit for enlistments hereafter, but it takes away credit for the enlistments that were already made?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Just one question.

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman is in error as to inductions. The local board is given credit for the men who are inducted. I had a case a few days ago of an accountant whom they needed in the service, who was inducted, and they wired the local board the authority to induct him.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If he came from class 1, they will get credit for him, but otherwise not.

As I said to you, the bill as reported is intended to deny and does deny these credits for volunteers. The law as it now exists allows credit to the draft district upon its draft quota for the number of soldiers so furnished, and my amendment adheres to that just principle. The purpose of raising armies is to get soldiers to fight the country's battles. It is immaterial to the Nation whether they come as volunteers or drafted men. But it is a vital thing to a community whether or not it is dealt fairly with as between other communities of like obligations in the matter of furnishing soldiers for the sacrifice of war. Under this law a draft district may have furnished voluntarily the entire number of soldiers required of it under a draft call, yet if its local board has put as many of its men in class 1 as has another district that has furnished no volunteers whatever, the county that has already given its full quota of men for the trenches of Europe will be required to give as many more as the county does that has furnished no volunteers. This is true of many counties in Nebraska. I do not believe that this House or the country will accept as a just application of the principle of universal liability to military service a law that will result in some sections furnishing several times the number of men to go to France and die in battle that other districts of the same military population are required to do.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. LENROTH, the new Senator from Wisconsin, placed in the RECORD a statement showing that five States have been given four-fifths of all the great war contracts made by the General Government up to the date of his speech. The labor of those contractors becomes very profitable if it can be retained for use on these contracts. If the local boards in those States place a small per cent of their registrants in class 1, it may easily result, if this bill becomes a law, that some States will grow rich during the war from the profit of the labor of their men who remain at home, while the rest of the States send their men to fill their places in the battle line. [Applause.]

The attempt is made to justify the bill that is now before the House upon the ground that the men of military age who stay at home because they have been placed in favored classes render a service that in some degree can be compared with that which the soldier gives to his country upon the field of battle. But no fair-minded man will contend for a moment that there is a similarity of service or sacrifice required from those who stay at home with that which is asked of the soldier in this war. No man makes a sacrifice at this time that can be compared in the slightest degree to that of the soldiers who are now fighting, struggling, and dying upon the blood-soaked battle fields of France. [Applause.] Hundreds of thousands of these men whom we are going to draft under this law are going to certain death before this war is over. Thousands of our boys may be dying there to-day. Those who stay at home are going to get rich and enjoy peace and happiness because the sacrificing soldier wins the war for him. The soldier starves and suffers from wounds and struggles through the mud of Flanders and dies in the trenches upon the sodden and trampled plains of Picardy. The man who stays at home receives bigger wages than he ever knew before; the products of his labor command enormous prices, compared to those paid for them in time of peace. You can never make the soldier nor the people of this country accept the plea that the man who stays at home in peace and plenty and gets rich because of the inevitable opportunities for money making in war time is in any sense giving service that is military in the meaning of the present law. [Applause.]

The selective-draft law, fairly and properly applied, can mean this and only this: Given a thousand registrants of military age, every man of them owes to his country the sacrifice of his life, if need be, upon the battle field to defend his country's rights or her existence. Only those are to be excused from among those registrants who are physically unfit to fight or to do other military service. The principle of selective conscription allows a board of local men to determine only the order in which those found liable and fit for service shall be called. If it is claimed that the bill under consideration does not specifically state that quotas are to be determined by the number in class 1, the Provost Marshal General has stated to the Military Committee that that is the rule which is to be put in practice—and it is the rule that this bill is asked to make possible—and he says that if he is given this bill as it comes from

his department he does not expect to have to invade any other classes except for experts, and that with the light and information that he has before him now he believes we will fight this war with the number of registrants in class 1.

To base the quotas upon the number of men placed in class 1 will result in the number of soldiers furnished by any draft district being the result of the opinions of men who, either through intent, ignorance, or misunderstanding, may so classify the men as to result in the grossest inequalities as between different communities and States.

In my own State of Nebraska the report as to the classifications made by the different boards in every draft district and furnished me by the governor shows the most glaring inequalities and variations as between counties of like numbers and character of population. I have placed some comparisons in the RECORD, and for the information of the House I had printed yesterday the entire report showing the total number of registrants, the number placed in class 1 by each draft board, and the number of registrants who have appealed in every county in the State. My information is that a very small per cent of exemptions from class 1 assignment are being allowed by district boards upon appeal. In the counties where I made inquiry they are so few as to have little effect upon the final figures.

Mr. ROGERS. Suppose a man is placed by a local board in class 2, who, in view of the general rulings and directions of the Provost Marshal General, should have been placed in class 1, is there any way of reviewing that action of the local board?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It is very difficult. There is a county agent, a lawyer, appointed to advise every board, and if he advises against it nothing can be done. In most of the counties they are told that they do not want any interference, and but few appeals are being granted.

But, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this proposed overthrow of the basic principle of the present draft law and the proposal to fight this war with an army to be raised solely from class 1, because I believe that it will result in disaster to the country and a wholesale delivery of men from liability to military service at a time when every thinking man knows that if we win this war we will have to arm every man of military age, as provided by the terms of the present act, and in all human probability raise the age limit high enough to make possible the levying of at least 10,000,000 of fighting men.

Let us have done with foolish fancies about winning this war with food, with ships, with speeches, with revolutions in Germany, with men behind the plow, with men in manufacturing plants and all other places where men are safe from German bullets and making money while the soldiers die. This war will be won, can only be won, when we put more fighting men in France than the central powers of Europe can muster; men with rifles in their hands and cannon and machine guns at their backs. We will only win it when we understand it is only with blood and iron and man power in overwhelming numbers that we can drive our enemy from one field to another, from trench to trench, from fortification to fortification, and across the Rhine; until we nail the Stars and Stripes upon the very gates of Berlin. [Applause.]

Let us look for a moment at the picture that the battle field of Picardy presents to-day. Though we have never been furnished the figures as to the comparative size of the armies now engaged in a death struggle, we know beyond any possibility of dispute that Germany was only able to start this great drive on a 50-mile front and plunge 40 miles deep into the center of the allied lines because, and only because, she had more men, overwhelmingly more men, with rifles in their hands and cannon to support them, with which to overcome the valor and the skill of the outnumbered allies. She has no better soldiers nor better guns; no more efficient leaders; she simply has more men and more guns. We must only expect to defeat them with a bigger and better armed force than they can possibly muster.

Why has Germany and Austria been able to muster a larger army than the allies do at this critical hour in France?

The allies outnumber them in population. The superiority in numbers of the German armies has been brought about because they have applied to the limit the principle of universal liability of their men of military age to render military service. Every man who is able to stand in the ranks is on the firing line, high and low, rich and poor, prince and peasant. You ask who does the work of Germany and France? I answer, it is done by those who are unfit to fight, too old or too young to be soldiers. The women and the children and the prisoners of war supply the rest. This is true of every nation in Europe which is in this war. We must prepare to do the same thing here. Many men are possessed of the soft notion that this war is a task that will not push this Nation to the very limit of its powers in order to win it. Too many men are thinking that this is a time to

make money; many of those who cry for this very bill which we have under consideration shout loudly that industry must not be disturbed. I say, Mr. Chairman, that every good American must get out of his head every thought of making money out of this war, or we are liable to lose it. Let those who are eager for war profits beware, and turn their attention to furnishing fighting men, or they may discover at the last that they have only been making money while their country bleeds, to at the last have to contribute their war profits to the Kaiser. [Applause.] We have decided that \$30 a month is sufficient pay for the soldier, who is asked to give his young life for his country's salvation. Let every man fix his mind on the soldier's pittance and resolve to contribute his surplus above that amount to his country as long as her very life is at stake.

The Provost Marshal General in advocating this very bill before the committee stated that the reason that he would fight the war with class 1 was that the prime object of the Nation should be to protect the economical and industrial life of the country. But we can not safely protect that life with the limited army that can be drawn from that class as at present selected.

It is in the printed hearings that the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Gordon] asked the Provost Marshal General whom he considered the greatest military genius that the present European war had produced. The General replied that no great military genius had arisen as a result of this war. He stated that this was a war of minor tactics, a war of commanders of small units, of captains and lieutenants. Well, it may be so in Washington; there are plenty of them here, I admit [applause], but in my opinion history will not record that verdict as the lesson of the battle fields of Europe.

Was it a war of minor tactics when five great German armies, composed of more than a million and a half of men, after the conquest of Belgium came pouring down into northern France and Marshal Joffre, that grand old hero of France, turned them back at the Marne, on a battle front of a hundred miles, and saved the democratic civilization of western Europe? [Applause.]

Was it a war of minor tactics when this man Hindenburg that now overtops the Kaiser with his fame in Germany, overthrew at Tannenberg, after seven days of battle on a front of 70 miles that great invading army of the Russians with a loss to them of 250,000 men and gave them a defeat that struck the first blow at the very vitals of the Russian Empire?

Was it a war of minor tactics when a year later, Von Mackensen swept with three great armies up through Galicia and united with the Germans who had captured Warsaw and overran Poland and finally put the Russian Empire out of the war and lost to our allies a force that only America is able to make up to them?

And is it a war of minor tactics that is being fought on the bloody plains of Picardy to-day, upon a battle front of almost a hundred miles? Millions upon millions of brave men are there straining in a colossal struggle with the whole world as a possible prize. The battle front at Waterloo extended for less than 3 miles. Gettysburg, Austerlitz, and Jena about the same. The armies that fought in those wars of the past were counted by thousands. The great battles of this world war are fought by millions of men upon either side.

Mr. Speaker, we must get out of our minds these fields of small dimensions, these ideas about small tactics. Captains and lieutenants are essential in this war, but in places of high command we must have men of unquestioned vision and understanding of the magnitude of the task we have undertaken. We have such a man in Pershing, who commands our troops in France. [Applause.] Let us give him the Army he must have to bring certain victory to our cause.

The idea behind the bill under consideration contemplates an army unequal to the task that confronts the country. The world is the stage of this great war and we should strive to become the chief actors in the drama and perform the principal part. The age of military service should be raised at once to at least 40 years, where the House put it when we passed the draft law. [Applause.] Personally, I am in favor of raising the limit to 60 years. It is over 50 in some of the European countries now. Many a man between 50 and 60 is still good for some kind of military service. Let him be required to render that service at the salary of the soldier. Let us preserve inviolate the basic principle of the present law, which, in my opinion, the proposed bill will destroy, and that is that every hundred men in America of military age that are physically fit shall be required to furnish the same number of soldiers, and that the only thing that the classification shall determine is the order in which those men shall be called to serve their country upon the field of battle. And also let us give credit for those

men who are brave enough to volunteer for the service of the Nation when she needs volunteers. [Applause.]

I append the amendment which I propose to offer to Senate joint resolution 123, which is the bill under consideration:

Amendment by Mr. SHALLENBERGER: On page 2, line 5, strike out all after the word "act," down to and including the word "act" at the end of line 8, and in line 11, after the period, at the end of the bill, add the following: "Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia or subdivisions thereof, called under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, shall hereafter be determined in proportion to the total number of persons registered and liable for military service therein, including resident aliens who have waived all claims for exemption, and credit shall be given on its quotas to any State, Territory, District, or subdivision thereof for the number of men who have entered the military service of the United States from any such State, Territory, District, or subdivision thereof since April 1, 1917, including members of the National Guard who were in Federal service on that date."

Mr. FIELDS. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker and gentleman of the House, it will be utterly impossible for me to discuss the merits of this measure in 10 minutes or to answer the criticism of my eloquent friend from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER]. As I sat in my seat and listened to his portrayal of the great struggle going on on the fields of Picardy, I wondered how he could take the floor in this House and undertake to strike down a measure that is intended above all things to help our country win this war. When we enacted the selective-draft law, we did it for the purpose of raising an army. There are two great fundamental facts underlying that law. One is that every man physically fit in this country is liable for military service. The other is that the Government has the undoubted right to say to a man, "You shall put on the uniform of a soldier and fight or you shall remain at home and perform the duties that will best tend to win the war."

Under that law boards were organized to register the young men of this country between the ages of 21 and 31, which this House and the Senate determined that between those ages we could find the men best fitted to build up an army. Nine million men and more were registered. After they were registered the call came, and they started in to call the first number—687,000. They went up the line, beginning at No. 258, the first number drawn, and they found under the law drafted men with dependents might be exempt. Are you opposed to that? They found the law provided that men engaged in agricultural enterprises in the United States should be exempt. Are you opposed to that? It provided further that students, doctors of divinity, ministers, and other classes should be exempt, and so they went up the line searching for men that properly fell in class 1, as provided in this bill, and we got the first 687,000.

Mistakes were made, men were put into the service that should have been exempt, others were exempted that ought to be put in the service, but we know that it is utterly impossible for boards to perform this duty without making some mistakes. They did make some mistakes, but every man on the Committee on Military Affairs, including the gentleman from Nebraska, is estopped from making complaints of the boards, for we insisted that the boards should be composed of men living in the various communities in which the men were to be selected, in order that they might know who were best fitted to go into the Army and the men that must be left out and the men who were necessary to agriculture and industry.

They selected 687,000 on the quota based on population. It took in women, aliens, and everybody, and did injustice to a great many communities. That would be fair if everybody composing the population was capable of being a soldier; but they are not.

The amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska, which bases it on the registrants rather than on the men in class 1, is equally unfair, for in the registration we have the aliens, cripples, halt, blind, deaf and dumb, and all the different classes that must be exempt.

What does this bill propose? It proposes that the quotas shall be based on the number of men in class 1 in each State in proportion to the number of men in class 1 in the United States. It proposes that of the men in any district, in any State, in class 1 the quota shall be in proportion to the number of men in class 1 in the State.

Who are in class 1? Why, the young men, the unmarried men, the married men supported by their wives—they and a few other classes not necessary to carry on the business of the country at home. Is there a man in this House who would say he would not stand for that proposition, but would prefer to enter into class 2 and class 3 and take therefrom the man from the cottage, leaving his wife and children behind; to take the man from the plow, who ought to be left at the plow; and take the man from the factory, whose services are needed? Surely

you would not; and yet the gentleman from Nebraska impugns practically the motives of the Judge Advocate General of the United States, a man whose heart, I believe, beats with patriotic fervor every moment in the day. He impugns the motives of the boards in his own State and in the State of every other man in this House—that they have corrupted themselves, that they have debauched the office to which they have been appointed, by exempting men from class 1 and putting others in class 1 that should not be there.

Gentlemen of this House, if there is any complaint to be made, it is not of the law but it is of the men who live in our own communities who administer the law. This amendment proposed by the War Department, passed in the Senate on March 1 and pending here ever since, will give the United States Government an army composed of men capable of serving the country and one which will do the least injury and disturb least the agricultural interests of the country.

Now, I have not time to discuss the bill and I wish I had. I want to say this, If there is any man who has a controlling feeling for his district in which he resides, for the State from which he comes, greater than his love for this great land in which we live, then vote for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska.

I want to mention one thing more before I leave it. That is, in relation to the volunteers. Gentlemen, we got credit for the volunteers in the first draft. The most of the men enlisted since that time and since the mobilization of the National Guard are men who are between the ages of 21 and 31, who felt they would rather enlist than be drafted. They were all properly in class 1. Therefore we got credit for them. The only ones we will not get credit for are those below 21 and above the age of 31. When we get into the discussion of the resolution under the five-minute rule, I perhaps will have a little more time; but I simply want to say this to you: The great State of Illinois, which I have the honor in part to represent, furnished its quota of volunteers, and furnished more men for the Marines than any State in the Union. It was second or third in the Navy, and went far beyond its quota in the Army of the United States, but I have not even taken the interest to look to see how this resolution will affect my congressional district, and why? Because, notwithstanding I love that old spot—I was born there, it is my home, I am proud of the history of my native State—I feel this way about it: If the thirteenth congressional district of Illinois has any young men in it who fall within class 1 under this resolution, and some county in Nebraska has not as many men in class 1 as Illinois, I want those Illinois boys taken to go into this army before I invade the district of my friend from Nebraska and take the married men and those men who are needed in Nebraska. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Just one moment. We must not forget that this is not a battle of Nebraska; this is not a battle of Illinois; but is a battle of the Nation, and it is a most terrific one. I want to say in conclusion that when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] talks about the army of ten million, he has not anything on me. I am for whatever sized army is necessary, and I want to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that when the bill was up for consideration in the House to provide an army of 1,000,000 men I did not hear him move to amend it to make it 10,000,000 men or 5,000,000 men. If you want to waste your time talking about getting a fellow over here who ought not to go, or a man over there who ought not to go, then vote against this bill, turn down the War Department, turn down your administration, and go back to your districts and tell your people that you did the best you could to keep them out of the war.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. WISE. The gentleman just stated that if we wanted to vote to turn down the administration or the War Department to vote against this resolution. I want to ask the gentleman if the Secretary of War in the hearings did not state specifically several times the opinion that credit should be allowed for volunteers?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is true.

Mr. WISE. What does the gentleman mean when he says that we would turn down the War Department if we vote against the resolution? To whom does he refer? The Secretary of War said that this bill ought to be amended.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not help but think of the Secretary of War as I do of my friend, as a civilian in responsible position, for whom I have a good deal of respect; but I prefer to take the word of a man who is a real soldier on a matter of this kind. I want to say one other thing, and that is that the

Judge Advocate General said, and I know my friend believes it, that it would be an absolute impossibility to administer that provision of the law.

Mr. WISE. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. In reply to that, I will state exactly what was said, and all he did say. The only reason he gave for not wanting to allow credit is because he was trying to relieve himself of an administrative difficulty; because of the trouble that it would put the department to to get the names of the people who volunteered and give credit; and that is the only reason he gave, and that is his language.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman think that it is a practical impossibility?

Mr. WISE. I do not.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And I want to say, in regard to the comment of the gentleman in respect to the married boys in Nebraska, that the gentleman, of course, is aware that nobody knows how many married men are in class 1. Every married man between the ages of 21 and 30 who did not claim exemption is in that class, and we know that 60 per cent of the men did not claim exemption. We also know that 262,000 of those who failed to respond, the delinquents, in the last draft are now in class 1; and figuring there will be as many more delinquents in this call, we would have 500,000; and no one knows at all how many of them are married, but we do know the counted population.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say in reply that, viewing the subject from my standpoint, I would take those out of class 1 who ought not to be there and put them where they belong.

Mr. CARAWAY. The gentleman would not turn down the War Department, would he?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the speech to which we have just listened did not discuss the joint resolution before the House, and therefore I shall read it:

Resolved, etc. That if under any regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," are placed in classes for the purpose of determining their relative liability for military service, no provision of said act shall prevent the President from calling for immediate military service under regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President all or part of the persons in any class or classes, except those exempt from draft under the provisions of said act in proportion to the total number of persons placed in such class or classes in the various subdivisions of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the terms of said act or from calling into immediate military service persons classed as skilled experts in industry or agriculture, however classified or wherever residing.

This proposed amendment to the draft law subjects to the arbitrary control of the military authorities all of the men in the United States between the ages of 21 and 30, inclusive, who are not in the military service, excepting only those who are unconditionally exempted from the draft by the provisions of the act of May 18, 1917.

Under section 2 of the aforesaid act it is provided:

Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act.

It is not my purpose to press upon the attention of the House any considerations in opposition to the act of May 18, 1917; my views upon that legislation were fully expressed at the time of the passage of the act, and while I have seen no reason to change the opinion then expressed this House, by a very large majority, indicated by a vote of its Members a different opinion than that entertained by me, and I have no disposition to renew the arguments which I then made. I know of but one thing in connection with the administration of the conscription law which won the universal approval of good citizens throughout the country, and this was the manifest fairness and impartiality with which the drawing by lots whereby the order in which the men registered should be called for military service was fixed. This was done under a regulation authorized by the law and carried out by the War Department in a manner that won universal approval throughout the country, and I have never heard a criticism of the justice and fairness by which the order in which these 9,600,000 men should be called into the military service was fixed and determined.

This proposed joint resolution repeals and revokes all the proceedings by which the order in which the men should be called into the military service was determined, save and ex-

cept those already in the military service, and authorizes the military authorities by regulations "heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President" to determine the order in which the remaining men shall be called into the military service.

The elaborate classification set forth in the majority report is important and instructive only in so far as it illustrates the possibilities of reclassifying the men in any way the military authorities may hereafter decide will be most convenient and expedient.

After the enactment of the draft law appeals were made throughout the country by many governors and other inferior officers to the people of the States and the several subdivisions urging them to enlist in the Regular Army or National Guard and thus relieve their States and localities from the obligation of furnishing men under the draft law. These appeals were unquestionably made in good faith, and thousands of voluntary enlistments were made in response to these appeals. This joint resolution repeals so much of the draft law as requires credit to be given to the different States and subdivisions for voluntary enlistment in the Regular Army or National Guard since April 1, 1917, and of members of the National Guard who had been called into the service of the United States prior to April 1, 1917, as provided in the act. It is sought to justify this legislation by calling attention to the injustice imposed by the administration of the draft law, whereby localities having a large alien population were required to furnish citizens for the Army where the alien claimed exemption upon that ground. The injustice resulting from the administration of the law to the several communities having a large alien population grew out of the manner in which the law was administered rather than out of the provisions of the law itself. The law required that quotas be apportioned to the several States and subdivisions thereof in proportion to their population, and in determining population the War Department divided the total registration on June 5, 1917, by the total estimated population, including aliens, and the quotient, 9.32 per cent, was assumed to represent the proportion which the registrants in each geographical unit represented of the total population thereof, and then to determine, for the purposes of the draft, the population of each county or division, the total registration in each geographical unit was divided by 9.32 per cent, and the quotient was accepted as the correct population of that county or division. It is obvious that this would result in a gross discrimination against all industrial localities which had a large proportion of men between the ages of 21 and 30, inclusive. For example, the city of Cleveland, which by the census of 1910 had a population of 560,663, was given an estimated population for the purpose of determining its quota under the draft of 1,125,440, while the city of Cincinnati, which by the census of 1910 had a population of 363,591, was given a population, for the purpose of the draft, computed from the registration of those between the ages of 21 and 30, inclusive, of 436,352. The city of Akron, which by the census of 1910 had a population of 69,067, was by the method of computation above referred to given a population for the purpose of this draft of 338,348. The only just rule for apportioning the allotment to the several States and subdivisions is to base the apportionment of each locality upon the men actually liable for military service plus the aliens who waive their exemption from liability for such service.

With the information in possession of the War Department provided by the answers to interrogatories designated "the questionnaire," there is no longer any reason or excuse for estimating the population or the number of men in each locality who are liable for military service under the law, including the aliens who have waived their claim for exemption on the ground of alienage.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The population was not determined by the Provost Marshal General.

Mr. GORDON. It was determined by the Census Bureau under a rule prescribed by the Provost Marshal.

Mr. KAHN. The rule, as I understand it, was based upon the proposition that they took the census of 1910 and then made an allowance of so many people to the family and multiplied it by that figure.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman is mistaken. It had no reference to the census of 1910. They took the total registration of June 5, 1917, and divided that by the total estimated population in continental United States on that date. The quotient was 9.32 per cent; and in order to determine the population for the purposes of the draft in a particular subdivision thereof they divided the registration by 9.32 per cent.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Multiplied it.

Mr. GORDON. No; not multiplied—divided.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What is the population of Akron, Ohio?

Mr. GORDON. I have given the population of 1910. It is a city that has grown quite rapidly, but I never heard a claim of over 100,000 or 150,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A hundred and fifty thousand?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. KREIDER. Do I understand the gentleman that the population was based on the registration?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; it was determined by a method of computation based upon the registration.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It was not based upon that, but attempted to be estimated from that.

Mr. GORDON. It was estimated from that. Of course it assumed every person registered had a family of four or five—represented a family of four or five, to be exact.

An amendment will be offered to the joint resolution by Gov. SHALLENBERGER fixing the quotas of the various subdivisions in accordance with the rule above stated and crediting each State and subdivision with all voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army and National Guard, as provided in the act of May 18, 1917, and also the men already called under the draft. This will correct every past injustice done to communities with large alien populations in the administration of the law and answer every useful and proper purpose subserved by placing aliens who claim exemption on that ground in a deferred class, as proposed by the majority report. If the power to reclassify is retained in the joint resolution, the effect of the proposed classification is purely speculative, because it may be abolished at will and a new system adopted.

The temptation of local boards to place their registrants in deferred classes and thus relieve their communities of their fair share of the burden of military service is the most patent objection proposed in the majority report, and the only answer to this is that arbitrary power is conferred upon the military authorities to alter, reform, or abolish this classification at will and create a new one, and this is equivalent to subjecting to the absolute control of the military authorities the bodies of these 9,659,382 men who are not unconditionally exempt from military service under the law or are already in the military service. This power is admitted in the closing paragraph of the majority report, where it is contended that persons improperly placed in deferred classes may be called into the service as "skilled experts" regardless of the class in which they may be placed. Every man of common sense knows that any man in the country who may fairly be said to possess special skill in industry or agriculture, and whose special services would be of real value, would promptly respond to a request of the President to render such service, whether he is liable to the draft or not, and the disposition of local boards to grant deferred classification in response to the importunities of registrants and their friends regardless of the interests of the public at large or the military service is too obvious to require extended comment.

The act of May 18, 1917, provides that it is based upon the liability to military service of all citizens between 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and provides for certain absolute exemptions which have been recently enlarged by the inclusion therein of alien declarants from neutral countries. The law authorizes the President to exempt from military service "persons engaged in industries, including agriculture, found to be necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment, or the effective operation of the military forces, or the maintenance of national interest during the emergency." The majority of the committee now proposes this amendment "to protect each and every community of the country against extreme hardship" by taking all of its young men who are not placed in deferred classes and relieve those communities who place their registrants in such deferred classes. This joint resolution proposes to increase the burden upon those communities in which the young men do not ask to be placed in deferred classes and to allow no credit to the counties and subdivisions which have furnished large contingents of volunteers for the Regular Army and National Guard. It adopts and legalizes every criticism made in the debate last year against the volunteer system, and yet deprives these young men of the credit, honor, and glory of making a voluntary gift of their services and lives to their country. It will not add one man to the available military resources of the Government; it repudiates and repeals the order fixed by the drawing last year and discriminates against the men already drafted into the service and in favor of those who happened to be drawn a little lower down in the list. This joint resolution is a paradox and an inconsistency. If

the draft law should be administered under it with all the rigor authorized, it can be made an instrument of oppression and favoritism by the military authorities. On the other hand, if, in its administration, men who request it be placed in the deferred classes, it is a return to the volunteer system, and "the stone which the builders rejected will have become the head of the corner."

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman from Ohio, before he takes his seat, allow me to call his attention to the hearings as to what Gen. Crowder said about the different proportion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORDON. I can save the gentleman that trouble. I have here a report of the Census Bureau which sets it out, and I have copied in my remarks the language of that report. There can be no mistake or misunderstanding about it whatever.

Mr. KAHN. The hearings show that Gen. Crowder said they made no suggestion to the Census Bureau about those figures.

Mr. GORDON. Well, I do not think that is important or material whether it is an error committed by one or the other; it was an error just the same and ought to be corrected.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, all this camouflage here about the great injury and injustice that is going to be worked on somebody because the War Department is endeavoring to correct the former evils of the draft law and put in the fighting men necessary to win this war should not be countenanced by this House. Over across the ocean now, as brought by the electric current and printed in the morning papers, American soldiers are on the battle front doing honor to themselves and this glorious Republic. Think of it, 40 miles of territory formerly occupied by the allies has since the 21st day of March up to the 11th day of April, including important towns, been captured by the Kaiser's hords. Great dangers confront not only the civilization of our allies but of the American Republic itself. Our institutions, our religion, our language, our Government, our civilization, our homes, and the virtue of our womanhood are now at stake, and yet we hear men talking about the espionage bill ought not to pass. Thank heaven, I heard it read here a moment ago, that the Senate had at last passed the espionage bill, which this House had passed some time ago. Some people during this awful war want free speech, want to allow a spy to be in every neighborhood of this country when our armies are in jeopardy over yonder. My friends, if I had my way, as soon as a spy was convicted I would send him to the graveyard at once. [Applause.] Free speech! With several millions of alien enemies in this country now when we are engaged in the stress of a holy and just war, and the civilization of the American Republic is hanging in the balance, some people talk about allowing anarchists, pro-Germans, and bolsheviks to stand on the street corners and cuss this Government of the United States when we are engaged in a great war. Of course, the bolsheviks, the pro-German, the anarchist, all anti-Americans, desire free speech. Free speech turned Russia over to the Kaiser. That type of free speech might turn America over to the war lords of Germany. Free press! All of us know we have a free press in time of peace, and we will have it as soon as this war is over, but every infernal newspaper in this country which publishes articles against the interests of this Government should be suppressed right now.

These pro-Germans and their henchmen, who are talking with traitors' hearts, endeavoring to pour the poison of disloyalty into the ears of the people, and, while doing this, outwardly pretending to be patriotic, should be arrested and put in jail or sent into the Army to fight for our liberties. [Applause.] Why should we not pass this pending military measure that the Senate passed 1 month and 11 days ago? My good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER], says that he wants an army of 10,000,000 men. We can not now get an army of that strength ready and trained over across the seas. If he wants an army of 10,000,000 men, why does he object to this proposition? The President of the United States said on the 5th day of June, 1917, 10,000,000 Americans between 21 and 31 years of age volunteered en masse to serve their country. We are going to bring out a bill from our committee in a few days that will volunteer 1,000,000 more who have reached the age of 21 since that day, and 1,000,000 consecutively each year thereafter. My good friend from Nebraska knows that under this bill we have here now we take, all the way through from California to Maine and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian line, every man between 21 and 31 years of age in class 1, regardless of what State he is in, providing, my friends, that

man has no dependent family on him; providing that man may have a wife and children but he does not support his family, but his family supports him; providing that man is a single man supporting no dependent mother nor orphan sisters; the idler, the man around who does nothing for the country; the man who is unessential to industry; the man who does not produce food for the support of somebody. Those are the men who are going to be taken in class 1 all over this Republic, and who objects to that? Do not you think that a man who has no encumbrance upon him, as old Caesar said, who has no "impedimenta" upon him, is the man who should be first called upon to volunteer under this law and go fight for the liberty and the civilization of the country? I do not want to go into the humble home and take the poor citizen, the husband who has a wife and four or five little children around his hearthstone, for whom he must go out and labor and support, but I want to take the single man; I want to take the married man who is too trifling to support a wife and children. [Applause.]

I want to take the man who allows his wife to work in a factory or teach school and support him in idleness. I want to take the class of parasites, my friends, who are not in the productive activities of this Republic, and the War Department has given you a bill which will do this thing. After we take them we may need more men. When we need them, we are going in and take the others of classes 2, 3, 4, and 5. We will take them all, if it becomes necessary, in order to win this war and save our Nation.

I want to say to my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] that having only class 1 this bill provides that we take the ones which can be best spared, which will be more than a million men a year, and that is all that we can get over to Europe with the shipping facilities which we now have in sight. If we raise an army of 10,000,000, what good could the gentleman's amendment accomplish, as it is plain all of the men in all the five classes would be drafted?

And I believe, like he does, that this war must be won by the man with the rifle and a bayonet on the end of it. You can not win this war with these aid societies and automobile drivers. You have got to win this war by men in uniform, with bravery in their hearts, who have got the bullets in their rifles, marching over the top and shooting the devil out of the Germans. [Applause.] That is the man who is going to win this war. Of course we need such side issues as aeroplanes, and such as that, but you have got to come down to the practical sense which has recently been demonstrated on the battle fields of Europe.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I have not the time.

On the western line, when old Von Hindenberg set that army of trained Dutchmen and Hungarians and Austrians marching across with rifled bayonets in their hands, he drove back the bravest army the world ever saw. You do not believe that these English and French soldiers fell back because they were cowardly. Artillery did not drive them back. It was the Dutchmen with rifles and bayonets on them.

My friend from Nebraska said that we can not adopt this bill which the War Department has put over here and raise the men. Do you believe that Gen. Crowder would be such a blatant fool as to want to reduce the capacity of the Government to raise an army?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I have not the time.

Do you believe, my friends, that any one of the war officials would want to get less soldiers? Why, this bill is to get more soldiers. This bill puts it up to this Congress to get more soldiers who can be most easily spared from the plow and other industries. Here we are engaged in this desperate conflict, on the plains of Picardy, around Toul, Arras, Montdidier, and Amiens, and some fear from this discussion one State might be called upon to furnish a few more over its quota. Nonsense. This is the Nation's war. It is not the war of any particular State.

The men are in this Republic. This pending measure reported by our committee will draft the ones who ought to go first. We can raise an army of many millions, beyond a question, and at the same time we will develop the list of activities and industries and everything that will keep this country with all its industries humming, with all the fields growing grain, with all the meadows growing live stock, with the war-munition activities in full operation, and at the same time have the men in camps and training, on the seas and on the battle front yonder in Europe, killing Germans. You can not be mealy-mouthed and talk in Sunday-school language about not fighting in this war. This is a war, and a hell of a war. [Laughter.] And we may just as well wake up to it, and let our people back home know

it. No man now should come up and talk about not wanting to fight. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky give me two or three minutes more?

Mr. FIELDS. I am sorry, but my time is all taken.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL.

The SPEAKER. This morning when we had up the squabble about Mr. Creel, things got mixed up a little. In the first place, the clerks, although there were three of them doing the counting, got the count wrong. Anyhow, the vote was announced in such a way that it gave one majority against the motion to table. It turns out they made a mistake of one; and they went out and corrected it. If it had been counted as it ought to have been, there would have been one majority for tabling. At the same time the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FULLER], who had answered "Present" when the roll was being called, asked to change his vote to "nay." The Chair, under the impression that he was one of these gentlemen who come in here after everything is over and ask to be recorded as "present," said that he could not vote. The Chair has examined the authorities thoroughly, and finds that he is entitled to vote, and the Chair ordered the Clerk to record the vote as "nay." And, by a curious turn, that restores it to exactly the way the vote was announced to start with. The only reason the Chair did not let him vote at last was because the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] impinged, and we had a sort of interlocutory performance, and by that time the Chair had forgotten it. It seems to the Chair that the Committee on Rules ought to take those propositions and fix a rule that is as clear as day on the subject. As I stated this morning, the only reason the Chair permits these gentlemen to come in here and vote "present" after the roll call is over is because, in ascertaining if a quorum is present, he has a perfect right to count them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the vote was being taken on the demand for the yeas and nays, and not on the question of no quorum being present.

The SPEAKER. The only reason for which the Chair can count a gentleman who is sitting in his seat and does not respond is in order to make a quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Even if they are present, after their names are called twice they are not entitled to be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. I know; but since they gave the Speaker the power to count those present and not voting, it seems ridiculous not to let them answer "present."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a very clear distinction between the roll call and the demand for the yeas and nays coming under the rule and a roll call when the point of no quorum is made.

The SPEAKER. I think that is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And I really think the rules are clear upon that. The Speaker has the right, of course, to count only in the event that the point of no quorum is made.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The Speaker never can tell when the roll is called that there is a quorum until the vote is announced.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Speaker does not have to determine that. The Speaker always determines that in advance; that is, upon the point of no quorum being made.

The SPEAKER. That is right. The way the vote was first reported by the Clerk was—yeas 165, nays 165, present 10. The way they got it when they went out and carefully went over it was—yeas 165, nays 164, present 10, and the Fuller vote restored it to where it started.

LIABILITY TO MILITARY SERVICE OF CERTAIN REGISTERED PERSONS.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this is a very happy occasion. There seems to be no difference of opinion between the majority and the minority except as to the best way to raise an army large enough to whip the Kaiser.

I deem this resolution in its present form unjust to my district, unjust to the State of Iowa, and unjust to all those other great States that have responded so nobly to the call to arms. In its present form it practically repeals the original conscription law, under which we have already built up a great Army. It wipes out the fundamental principles of many of the important features of this law and it takes away from the various counties and States rights and privileges already granted them and under which they have been doing their utmost to provide an army for the Nation.

When the conscription plan was agreed upon, it met with little opposition either in the committee or in the House. Both those who were for volunteers first and conscription afterwards and those who wanted only conscription, agreed absolutely on the provisions of the conscription law as it is now, and it was so placed in the bill when reported to the House nearly one year ago. There were some of us at that time who thought that a volunteer army should have preceded conscription—who believed that an army of older, hardened fighters, such as Theodore Roosevelt, would have collected, should have been given an opportunity to go first. We thought they could have been put on the battle line quicker and would have created greater enthusiasm. However, in the wisdom of this Congress this plan was rejected, and since it was enacted into law the conscription act has received the hearty support of every loyal citizen in this country. It has been administered with excellent justice, and I congratulate the President of the United States and the Secretary of War upon their equitable plan of selecting those who were to be our first National Army fighters.

The conscription bill was a promise to the American people that any county or State should be given credit for the men within their confines who enlisted in the Regular Army or the National Guard. In some counties and in some States the enthusiasm for this war was much greater than in others and, as a result, a much larger number of men voluntarily enlisted. These men were anxious to fight, they were able to arrange home ties so they could go at once, and they went. I congratulate the War Department that the promise in this conscription bill has so far scrupulously been kept and that each county and each State has been given credit for that advance guard that preceded the assembling of our National Army. In providing a fighting force for the United States, most of the counties and most of the States have acted in good faith on this promise that was made, and it seems to me that if we pass this resolution in its present form we are breaking faith with the people and in so doing we will work a great hardship upon those communities that have responded so loyally to the original conscription plan. In many instances communities will be forced to send several times the number of men to camp when the next draft comes that they would have had to send if those who went first had not voluntarily given their services to their country.

The second congressional district of Iowa patriotically furnished to this Nation 10 organized units of National Guardsmen and many times its quota of Regular Army enlistments. The State of Iowa enlisted four times its quota in the Regular Army and the National Guard. We have received credit already for these enlistments. You now propose in this resolution to take those credits away and compel us to furnish, in addition to our regular future men liable for military service, the number of men that we have already been given credit for as going out in the Regular Army or National Guard as volunteers. This makes an "Indian giver" out of your Government.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I am interested in that remarkable statement that the gentleman is making. How can we recall credits which the Government has already conferred by way of credit for these voluntary enlistments?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question. That is one point that is hardly understood. It is a hard one to understand. But it is true that you take back what you have already given. I called the attention of the Secretary of War to this and he did not deny it, and I am not going to try to debate it in my own words; but I am going to tell you what the Secretary of War said on that very point, because he caught the idea at once and he was fair enough to admit the truth of it, and he put it in better words than I can. I read from the hearing:

Mr. HULL. In regard to changing the quota, is it not true, Mr. Secretary, that if you change the quota, to a certain extent the law becomes retroactive? For instance, in our State there are certain counties which, owing to the enlistments in the National Guard, for which they are given credit, had enough men in the Army so that there were no men taken in the draft at all. They have a larger proportion of people in class 1 than would have been left if they had not had those enlistments in the National Guard. If you take away those credits they would go right back and take those boys. Is that not true?

Mr. GORDON. Is there not an error in your statement that there is a larger quota in class 1 because a larger proportion enlisted?

Secretary BAKER. The persons who enlisted must have been wholly outside of the draft age or they would have been originally in class 1.

Mr. GORDON. But if everybody in the draft age had enlisted in the National Guard I do not see how you can say it would have that effect.

Secretary BAKER. It would depend upon whether your enlistment in the National Guard meant the enlistment of men who would have otherwise been in class 1.

Mr. HULL. Usually they were not, and that leaves the men in class 1 in there.

Secretary BAKER. I am not sure of that; but I should think it would be practically true everywhere.

Mr. HULL. The point is this, that men in some communities enlisted in the National Guard and men in other communities did not. They have already received their credits.

The CHAIRMAN. They will not receive credit if this resolution is adopted. That part of the draft law will be repealed if this resolution passes; Gen. Crowder admits that.

Secretary BAKER. They have received credit, and there is no express repeal of that part of the law. But I think Mr. Hull is right; that in communities in which men beyond the draft age enlisted in any large numbers it will have the effect of increasing the size of class 1, and therefore increasing the quota basis. I do not know how large that will be.

Mr. GORDON. We passed a military bill which fixed the age for service between 21 and 31 years, inclusive. Because persons outside of that age are enlisted, would the same rule apply in crediting quotas?

Secretary BAKER. No; but what you did, Mr. GORDON, was this: You passed a law which fixed the draftable age from 21 to 30 years, and you fixed the National Guard age from 18 to 40 years, and then provided that to the extent that persons from a State volunteered in either the Regular Army or the National Guard that should be credited on its quota.

Let us take Ohio, for example. Suppose 10,000 persons in Ohio between the ages of 30 and 40 years volunteered in the National Guard. When we came to the draft in Ohio, we credited Ohio with 10,000, and that exonerated an equivalent number of persons who would have been between 21 and 30 years if we had relied solely upon the draft in that State.

When the second draft comes, the number of Ohio's quota will depend not upon those who have previously gone into the military service, but upon the total number of persons in class 1 in the State; and then all the persons previously exonerated because somebody else volunteered, being in class 1, become a part of the basis upon which the assessment of that State is based, and so the limitations of that State are increased.

Mr. GORDON. Could not an amendment be included in this resolution that would cure that?

Secretary BAKER. The original law gave credit.

Mr. KAHN. The law gave credit for those who had volunteered.

Secretary BAKER. Why would you not accomplish the whole purpose if you say that the basis shall be the number in class 1, but there shall be credited to that—use the language of the old law, giving credit for the number in class 1?

Does the gentleman understand?

Mr. SLOAN. I see your drift.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Then Secretary Baker asserted that this bill ought to be amended, saying:

We all agree that if this rule in the joint resolution had been proposed from the beginning it would have been a wiser rule. The only question now is whether, in view of the fact that we have already started on the other, we can fairly change it now.

Now, that is the contention of myself, at least, and I think most of the minority Members on this bill contend that it is unfair to change this plan after you have started to form an army under the other plan. Right here I want to call your attention to the following letter which I received from the governor of Iowa:

COMMONWEALTH OF IOWA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Des Moines, April 4, 1918.

Hon. HARRY E. HULL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have done everything possible from this end of the line in an effort to convince the War Department that the proposed plan of apportionment will be inexcusably unfair to Iowa.

I know that you will not cease in your endeavor to secure a square deal for this State, and trust you will be able to get the other members of the Iowa delegation to view the matter in the right light.

With sincere personal regards, I am,

Cordially, yours,

W. L. HARDING.

I understand also that the President of the United States has made a statement to the effect that, inasmuch as this conscription plan was drawn and operated with the promise that counties and States should be given credit for volunteer men, there was grave doubt that it should be changed at the present time.

Let me call your attention to another grave objection to this proposed legislation. Heretofore our boards of registration were for this one purpose only, but this resolution practically makes exemption boards of them. They were never intended as such; they were not notified that they were to act in this capacity. Is it right to hold them responsible for acts that they did not know they were to perform? And the result shows that nearly every board has placed a different interpretation upon the law, and that exemptions have varied accordingly.

Another grave defect in this resolution, in my opinion, is the fact that it abolishes county and State quotas; in other words, it does not equally distribute the burden of this war. Counties and States who have interpreted the conscription law strictly, and thereby placed large numbers of their men in class 1, will be penalized under this provision. Under this law the State which has been lax in providing sufficient men will shift the burden to the State which has been diligent in so doing. Why should Iowa provide men to make up Connecticut's quota, or vice versa? Because Massachusetts exempted a large number of men and Michigan, perchance, did not, why should Michigan men go into Massachusetts camps to make up its quota? Because some counties in my district held every man available, why should they necessarily send

men to make up some other county's quota? That is what this resolution provides. It is a sad feature that complete statistics of the number of men in each State placed in class 1 and the percentage in respect to the total registration are not available. In fact, that is one objection to the passage of this resolution at this time. It seems to me that we should not pass a matter of this importance until we have all the information we could secure. Admittedly, we are sadly lacking in this instance. Practically no States are complete, and I am satisfied that not 50 Members of this House know the figures from their own district.

However, I can give you some figures from my own State showing the enormous discrepancy in the percentage of registrants who were placed in class 1. For instance, in the second district of Iowa 13,294 registered, and of these 4,200 were placed in class 1, 31 per cent of the entire registration. In the eighth district of Iowa 14,398 men registered, and only 2,959 were placed in class 1, just 20 per cent. In other words, the eighth district of Iowa had 1,104 more registrants than the second district, while the second district placed 1,250 more men in class 1. Under the original conscription law the eighth district would be compelled to furnish more men than the second, but under the proposed law, when the eighth district had exhausted its supply of men in class 1 the War Department would have the authority to make up its quota from the men in class 1 in the second district. I think you can readily understand the injustice of this.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. What has the gentleman got to say as to the practical difficulties which Gen. Crowder refers to in making allowances for voluntary enlistment?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There has been no difficulty at all.

Mr. HUSTED. As I understand it, Gen. Crowder says there has been great practical difficulty in making these allowances, and that is the reason for the legislation.

Mr. SLOAN. They have men there who keep track of it, and I understand they have done it correctly.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I should like to ask the gentleman if a record is not kept in the War Department of every man who enlists or volunteers, so that they know exactly where he is?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Why, certainly. Now, let me call your attention to a discrepancy in counties: Muscatine County, in my district, registered 2,671 men, and of these 1,002 were placed in class 1—38 per cent of the total; Louisa County, which adjoins Muscatine County, registered 1,025 and placed only 230 in class 1—22 per cent. Under the proposed resolution Muscatine could be made to fill out Louisa County. I deem this unfair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has any effort been made, or is any effort being made, to bring the figures up to an equality in the counties where they have been unequal?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understand there have been warnings sent out, but I call the attention of the gentleman to this fact, that after a man has been once placed in one of these classes it is a very hard thing to get him placed elsewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is possible, however, to bring a man up out of class 2 into class 1, is it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I presume that it is possible, but I do not know where the law is for doing that.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. I will say for the information of the gentleman that the Provost Marshal General informs me that in every case where, on the face of the return, it appears that there has been favoritism, the board has been ordered to re-classify.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, I understand that. That has all been gone over. The trouble is that the statement put out by Gen. Crowder in to-day's paper is camouflage pure and simple.

Mr. ROGERS. Has the gentleman any information as to whether there has been a tabulation by States?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have one or two States here. If the gentleman will let me go along I will tell him about that.

Mr. ROGERS. A tabulation showing the classification into the different classes?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes. Clinton, a city of the second district, placed over 35 per cent of her registered men in class 1; Cedar Rapids, in the fifth district, placed only 23 per cent of her registered men in class 1. If the same rule had been followed in Cedar Rapids as was followed in Clinton there should have been 482 more men from Cedar Rapids. Is it a square deal to ask Clinton to make up what Cedar Rapids has exempted

through a different interpretation of the rule? Waterloo, a rival town and in every way similarly situated, has placed 42 per cent; or, in other words, Cedar Rapids, with 4,000 registered, placed only 958 in class 1, while Waterloo, about 50 miles northwest of Cedar Rapids, placed 1,554 out of 3,715 registered, or nearly twice as many men are to be called from Waterloo as from Cedar Rapids, although Cedar Rapids apparently is a larger town. Can anyone explain why Waterloo should be forced to help Cedar Rapids make up her deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman has referred to Cedar Rapids as having a comparatively small number in class 1. I will say to the gentleman that there is a little college in Cedar Rapids that sent 160 men, every man of them a volunteer, and every one of whom would have been in class 1. Instead of that they are placed in class 5. The young men of Cedar Rapids enlisted in such numbers that, of course, it reduced the number in class 1. So when the call came not a man was drawn from Cedar Rapids, because the patriotism of that town was such that her boys had enlisted and had not waited for the draft. That is the reason.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say for Cedar Rapids that I know the people of that town. I lived there myself. I was raised there, and I know the people, and they would feel humiliated at the idea of having Waterloo send any men to war in the place of men that Cedar Rapids ought to furnish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to say that Cedar Rapids would furnish her quota, but the trouble comes from the false interpretation of the rule and the difficulty that it is going to create.

Hardin County, in the third congressional district of Iowa, out of 623 registered placed 547 in class 1, or 87 per cent. Wayne County, in the eighth congressional district of Iowa, a very similar county, south of Hardin, out of 1,196 registered placed 180 in class 1, only 15 per cent. Could anyone ever convince the Hardin County farmers that they were treated fairly when, after furnishing all this fighting force, they were compelled to make up a deficiency in Wayne County?

Let me give you another illustration showing a State discrepancy. According to Gen. Crowder—figures not complete—South Dakota registered 54,103 men; of these 20,423 were placed in class 1—43 per cent. Rhode Island registered 51,648; of these 13,216 were placed in class 1—25 per cent. Under the proposed resolution when Rhode Island had exhausted the men placed in class 1 the men in class 1 in South Dakota would be taken to make up Rhode Island's allotment.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have but two minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. The explanation is that the men of Rhode Island and the East have gone into the Navy, and they will perhaps go to class 5.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have heard a much better explanation than the gentleman gives, and that is that the East took the Army contracts, and they filled their munition factories with their young men, and they want to pass this law in order to exempt them. That is the real truth of the matter. [Applause.]

Mr. SIEGEL. I have the figures right here.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Figures prove nothing in this case. I have no time to yield further. I decline to yield. Let me make another State comparison. According to the figures furnished by Gen. Crowder, Utah, with 40,040 registered, placed 8,873 in class 1, or 22 per cent. Wyoming, with 21,211 registered, placed 8,546 in class 1, or 40 per cent. Is there any Member of the House of Representatives who can explain why Utah, nearly twice as large, should furnish only as many men as Wyoming? I presume the answer to this will be that Gen. Crowder can be depended upon to see that these communities do their duty; but why should this Congress repeal a good law in order that Gen. Crowder can reenact it by rules and regulations?

This Nation must have a great army; anywhere from five to eight million men must stand ready at our call. If you will let the conscription law alone and not try to tinker it, this law will produce an army of 4,000,000 men from those now registered. This, with the number of young men who will come into class 1 when the boys arriving at the age of 21 years are enrolled, and with the present enlisted Army, will make a grand total of over 6,000,000 men. To do this, however, you must ask every community to furnish every man that should have been placed in class 1.

In looking over the figures that we have already received we find that some States have placed 40 per cent of their men in class 1: any number of counties have done the same thing. Surely with these figures we can safely say that 40 per cent of those registered in the entire country should be held liable for military service.

We should all stand loyally behind the President, Commander in Chief of the Army—give him the best laws that we can in order to raise money and men. It is my best judgment that it is a better plan to follow the present law and expect every community to abide by it, than it is to let the idea get abroad that because the board has failed to place the men in class 1 that it should it has thereby avoided that community's liability for furnishing men to make up this army.

Iowa is practically a farming community, and any change in the law by which Iowa has to furnish more men than her share is to just that extent reducing the number of farmers. A good farmer is a skilled worker and should never be taken in order that any man in some other community working in a munition factory should be exempted as a more useful citizen than the Iowa farmer. Imperial Iowa asks no favors. She will furnish her share of money, much more than her share of food products—more than any other State—and is willing to furnish to the last drop of blood the number of men that she should in proportion to the population or those found liable for military service. All she asks is to be treated on the square, that the Government scrupulously keep its promises, and when Iowa has done her duty this Government hold rigidly to the line and say to any who hold back, "Look at grand old Iowa. Go thou and do likewise." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the seriousness of the situation that confronts the country at this time. I am not concerned with the question whether this or that district provides more men for service for the country, when the country needs their service and needs it urgently.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It will be impossible for me to get through in 10 minutes, unless the gentleman can give me more time.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I am sorry that I can not give the gentleman the time.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district of more than 300,000 people, and while the majority of my people in my opinion would have preferred the volunteer to the draft system, there has never been a whimper from one of these 300,000 people. I have never had any communication or protest of any sort against the way the law was enforced, nor, although it has been discussed in the newspapers, has there been any complaint of the proposed law, the wisdom of which I believe in.

Of course, this suggested amendment to the draft law comes from the War Department. It deals exclusively with a military question, and we must assume that it is the matured, well-considered view of our military experts as to what is necessary to win the war as quickly and completely as we all hope to see it won.

That is the great task to which our hands are set, and those of us not trained in such matters should not reject the advice of military and naval experts on purely professional questions without being absolutely certain that our own contrary view is the right one. It is generally understood that this proposal originated with Gen. Crowder, the Provost Marshal General, a man whose judgment I greatly respect.

I was originally opposed to the conscription law, and I am not in love with it yet; but it is law, and as such I shall respect it and will do all I can to make it as effective as possible. It is a tool to be used in the prosecution of the war, and we should use it as intelligently as possible to put an end to the horrors of war and to try to save liberal government from the tyranny of militarism.

This resolution impresses me as an effort to justify the word "selective" as it has been used in connection with the draft. The selection should be intelligently done and not left to chance, as it is when a blindfolded boy, by taking a numbered disk from a box, says who shall serve. That process is fair as between the individuals whose numbers are in the box, but it is not intelligent.

Certainly it is better for society at large to take a man who has no wife or child or parent or other person dependent on his earnings than to take one with either of these responsibilities. It is a lot better to take a man who is an unskilled farm laborer than to take one who knows all about the cultivation of the soil and the planting and harvesting of crops at a time when all the world is clamoring for food.

Every man in the country between 21 and 31 years of age is liable to military service, and under the authority given the President by Congress may be called to service. Is not it better to first take those who by reason of their age and social relations can be taken with the least disturbance of the social

order? And is not it right before the actual work of selection begins to quietly sit down and divide all availables into classes as the Provost Marshal General has done? It insures a better selection and expedites the work, and every day we are con-jured by our allies and our own newspapers to hurry.

That this new plan departs from that first adopted is not of great importance. We learn by experience, or we should. There is nothing sacred about the original plan of taking registrants from the States and Territories on the basis of population as ascertained by the census of 1910.

Nor is the law as it stands entirely fair. As the report submitted by Mr. FIELDS says, some States, or communities, to use his own language, have decreased in population while others have increased. A moment's reflection will convince anyone that where that is the case the community that has lost population will be unfairly forced to send a disproportionate number of its young men to war, while the community that has increased its population will not contribute a fair quota to the Army. Aliens, unless they happen to be enemy aliens, will not be forced to leave the country, and under the law as it is to-day can not be put into our Army or Navy. Thus, communities that have an excessive alien population can go on with their ordinary industries, their opportunities to prosper being made secure by the sacrifices of Americans from other and less prosperous sections. This resolution will correct that situation, partially at least.

The fact that trained, experienced farmers and expert mechanical and industrial workers are placed in class 4 appeals to me as a wise provision of the proposed law.

There is an embarrassing shortage of both classes, and it is necessary to keep both employed in the particular sort of labor for which they are best suited if we are to keep our armies properly fed, clothed, and armed. A few days ago I read in a county weekly newspaper a story of the departure for camp of 42 drafted men, of whom 28 were farmers, and that in a county that is embarrassed by a labor shortage.

I am not impressed by the argument of the minority that the proposed change in the law will give the military authorities control of the bodies of 9,000,000 of our citizens. We will be fortunate if it does not control twice nine million men before the war is ended. To save its life the country can command the lives and fortunes of all our people. We may yet be forced to advance the age limit to 50 or more, as our powerful enemy has done, as Great Britain is doing, and as France, the only great Republic in Europe, has been compelled to do to preserve the liberties of her people.

Let the American people understand what is expected of them in the war, and they will respond freely, spontaneously, completely. I refuse to believe that there are more than a negligible number of people in the country, even of foreign birth, of Teutonic origin, if you please, who are not loyal to the American Republic.

Immigration from central Europe to our country has been relatively unimportant for 20 years. Those who came earlier are loyal as are their sons, who volunteered in large numbers, and who have, in the main, responded uncomplainingly to the draft. They are doing their duty in other respects, also.

The San Antonio Daily Express that reached me this morning contains three news items of unusual interest. Two are from Comal County, which was settled by a German colony in 1845, and one from my own county of Bexar, and all tell about the enthusiastic support of the liberty loan. And, by the way, these subscriptions were made on the 5th of April, the day before the loan was officially on the market. If there is any special distinction or reward of any sort, for being first in the country in the way of subscriptions I now formally file the claim of Comal County for that honor.

Let me read you these news items:

NEW BRAUNFELS, TEX., April 5.

All business houses were closed two hours this morning to give everyone an opportunity of attending a liberty-loan rally at the courthouse. An enthusiastic meeting was held; a number of local speakers, with convincing arguments, told of the need of every citizen doing his utmost to aid this loan and carry Comal County "over the top." Every preparation has been perfected for launching the great drive on the opening day.

A later telegram of the same date says:

NEW BRAUNFELS, TEX., April 5.

New Braunfels and Comal County have gone "over the top" in subscribing \$125,000 to the third liberty loan. This amount was wired the Federal reserve bank to-night by two local banks, oversubscribing the county's quota by nearly \$1,000.

Gov. Hobby has offered a silk flag to the first county subscribing over its quota. Comal County lays claim to the prize.

That subscription represents about \$15 each for the population of the county.

Another encouraging fact reported in the same paper is that the Sons of Hermann, a benevolent and social organization, sub-

scribed for \$10,000 worth of the bonds, having placed the order with a Texas bank before the bonds were on the market.

I will print that item also, for it may help to calm the minds of some excited and unjustly suspicious people who forget that all the population of our country, except the native Indians and the descendants of Africans, are of European origin, and that names, whether English, French, Spanish, or Teutonic, only suggest origin. They forget Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, the preacher, patriot, and statesman, who was the first Speaker of this House, and his brother Peter, also preacher, patriot, and statesman, who served in the First, Third, and Sixth Congresses. Their names would bring them trouble now if they lived in some States.

Karnes County, in a district where crops have failed for two successive years on account of drought, oversubscribed its quota by 10 per cent on the 6th. It took no driving to make the people of Karnes do their duty.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these facts as an appeal for tolerance, justice, and union. Let us all pull together in facing a powerful and common enemy. Let us learn the lessons of the casualty lists where Teutonic names appear with English and French names. From my district young men who are descendants from these early German colonists in Texas have died on the field of battle fighting for the liberty typified in the American Republic. Some of them lie buried on the bleak seashore of Scotland or in the waters that wash those shores, victims of the submarines.

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend—or for a cause. [Applause.]

SONS OF HERMANN BUY \$10,000 WORTH LIBERTY BONDS; MAY BUY MORE IN SAN ANTONIO.

Alfred W. Rhode, secretary of the Hermann Sons' Home Association, of this city, has received a letter from the grand president of the order of the Sons of Hermann of Texas, Julius Schramm, of Granger, stating that he had just placed an order for \$10,000 worth of the third issue of the liberty bonds with the Taylor National Bank. Mr. Rhode knew of the contemplated purchase by the grand lodge and wrote to the grand president with a view of having the order placed here in San Antonio.

He stated further in his letter that he would take a trip to San Antonio in the near future and may purchase another \$10,000 of these bonds in San Antonio while here.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the difference between the resolution and the Shallenberger amendment does not involve the size of the Army. Neither resolution nor amendment adds a single soldier to the number now authorized. Nor does the Shallenberger amendment affect the classifications of the questionnaire, in so far as the classification pertains to the relative military duty in a community between the registrants thereof. To this extent the Shallenberger amendment carefully preserves the five classes. The radical difference between the two propositions in principle is that the Shallenberger amendment seeks to fairly distribute the burden throughout all sections of the country and requires each community to bear its fair share of military service. The original resolution seeks to obtain the soldiers without the slightest consideration as to the duty of the several communities.

As the gentleman from Nebraska, Gov. SHALLENBERGER, has so well said, the real burden of this war falls on the fighting men, and the real burden of the war falls on the community that furnishes the fighting men. Whatever burden a community must carry, the real burden is the contribution it makes of man power to the firing line. If you believe that this burden should be equitably borne by each community, with a relative duty amongst the registrants fixed by the classification of the questionnaire, you will vote for the Shallenberger amendment. So many people—so many fighting men. The draft law prescribed the distribution of this burden amongst the communities by population. In some communities owing to the alien population congested there this worked an undoubted hardship, but the hardship was very much localized. It was only in a few spots. The Shallenberger amendment preserves the principle of population, but corrects the irregularities justly complained of. The registrants represent the population, and the inequalities are corrected by excluding aliens and those not liable for military duty.

By adopting this method not only is the burden fairly placed but there is no possibility of the local boards escaping the responsibility of making a fair adjustment of the relative liability between registrants of their community. Under the so-called resolution of the War Department the temptation will be for each board to relieve its own community at the expense of some other community. This has been called a War Department measure, but I can not conceive how that can be called a War Department measure when the Secretary of War himself condemns it in an important particular, and when the Presi-

dent himself, as I understand it, has condemned it in a like manner. I have the testimony of the Secretary here showing that in the principle, the very radical principle, that I am contending for he stands with the minority, and I shall read his testimony on that point. He says:

The actual population of any place in this country is indeterminate or undeterminable by anybody's guessing, and if we can find a rational way to relate it to the Army, comparing the liable population of communities without doing injustice by reason of anything that has already gone on, I should think that would be highly desirable.

In other words, the Secretary of War has said to this Congress that if you can find a method by which this quota can be apportioned to those liable for military duty, he will stand for it. We claim that the proposition made by Gov. SHALLENBERGER meets that very requirement. He provides that all these registrants in all these classes shall be counted as liable to military duty, and that the quota shall be based in any community upon the number that are liable to military duty. Then, too, the Secretary has said credit should be given for volunteers. As I say, I do not see how it is possible to call this an administration measure when it is condemned in an important particular by the Secretary of War himself. Another thing I desire to direct attention to. This bill was framed by a gallant old soldier who evidently had in his mind simply and only the sole consideration of how he was going to get men for his armies, and he gave very little consideration, I think, to anything else. I have his testimony, which I would be glad to read here. The question was, On whom does the burden fall—on what community? It falls on the rural communities; it falls on the farmer. That is what Gen. Crowder says. In his testimony he says:

There is another thing to be taken into consideration. Class 1 ought to be uniform; that is, the same proportion of citizens ought to go into class 1 in all States, except where skilled labor must be considered. Skilled labor is not generally found in rural communities; it is always found in urban communities. Class 1 in the urban communities is not going to be quite as large as it will be in rural communities, because there are a greater proportion of skilled men found in class 2.

You might say at first that there the rule would work inequitably in transferring the burden to the rural population, but I do not think it will operate in that way, because I have to invade the deferred classes for skilled men. We shall have to take the men right out of classes 2, 3, and 4, where they can be found, in order to fill these special requisitions. So there is a compensation there that ought not to be lost sight of.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. KING. What I would like to know is this: Has the President of the United States requested that this legislation be adopted without amendment?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. He has said that it ought to be amended.

Mr. KAHN rose.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman ought not to make a statement of that kind without giving authority for it.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I give as authority a letter which I understand the President wrote to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FIELDS. I think the letter would not bear out the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Does not that letter distinctly say it should be amended in so far as giving credit for volunteers is concerned?

Mr. FIELDS. I recall in referring to one point that it said the question was debatable, but the President was inclined to think the War Department's side of it was right.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Not as to giving credit.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. KING. Can the gentleman secure that letter and have it put in the RECORD as a part of his remarks?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I will say that the chairman of the committee has the letter, and I understand it is going to be put into the RECORD so that there will be no question as to what the President said. I want to explain, for Mr. HARRISON's benefit, one thing. He has stated the general proposition that the President thinks the bill should be amended so as to allow credit for volunteers, but upon the other side of the question, including the proposition to base the quota that I propose, he says it is a debatable question, and he rather leans the other way.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think my colleague yielded to me.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman says that Gen. Crowder states that class 1 is going to be larger in the rural than in the urban communities?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Does not that come about in this way, by an arbitrary ruling on the part of Gen. Crowder

that men who spend their lives in the profession and pursuit of agriculture are not skilled laborers in that respect?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; that it was unskilled labor in the country.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And that men who have spent their lives in that particular work are not skilled laborers as a result of it?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The Army view is that the labor of the country is generally unskilled.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And as a result of that ruling class 1 is made bigger in the rural than in the urban communities?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Surely.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I will.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to understand what is meant by the War Department. It seems the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] thinks that the War Department is some general or other, and not the Secretary of War. He tells of what the War Department wants, and when you come down to it, it is nobody but some general, Gen. Crowder or somebody else, and I would like to have settled the question as to who is the War Department.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. He will have to do that.

Mr. FIELDS. If the gentleman will permit, the Provost Marshal General is the man designated by the War Department to carry into execution this draft law, and is responsible for raising the Army.

Mr. BURNETT. That is what is meant by the War Department, is it?

Mr. GORDON. He is an executive officer; he is not responsible.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Now, gentlemen, I want to tell you when you go back to your homes and investigate how this thing is going to affect your own district, you will find that it is going to work a gross injustice among the several counties of your district, and it will be in a way in which you can not justify yourself before your people.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And is not there a reason, since the gentleman raised that question, that the counties that find they have some lower numbers will not complain, but that every county that has too many soldiers taken is going to complain?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Surely, and some sections of this country, in places like that of my friend from Nebraska, have had an extraordinary burden placed upon their State as against some other sections, where the burden has been very light. Before I get away further, when this thing was first proposed I telegraphed to every board in my district to send me word how it was going to affect their counties. I have two counties lying right side by side, each has exactly the same number of registrants, and one of them, as I say, in the same community virtually, has a large credit for volunteers, much larger than the other, and yet the county which has furnished a very large volunteer force will have to furnish twice the number of soldiers as the other. I have another county that has 1,125 total registrants, and it lies right opposite another that has only 570, and that county which has only 570 registrants will have to furnish two soldiers for every one that the one that has 1,125, and the one that has 570 registrants is the one that has the most farmers in it. I obtained the information as to the number of farmers in class 1 at the same time I obtained the other information. So when you go back to your district, how are you to face the injustice worked between counties of your own district? You go into one of your counties and you are met by the people there, and you find that by this rule its burden has been just double that of another county, without any excuse for it, without any necessary public policy requiring it, the character of people being the same. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I want to bring out some more facts, gentlemen, and I am going to do it under the five-minute rule if I get the opportunity. I would ask the gentleman to yield me two minutes more in order to answer the proposition about credit.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. It is said here that counties with volunteers get credit by reason of the fact that volunteers are not placed in class 1. It is claimed that by reducing the number of class 1 by the volunteers credit is thus given. Now, I will just illustrate it at once so you will see that can not be true.

Here are two boards, and each of them has exactly the same number in class 1. Each has 1,000, but one has a credit of 1,000

in the shape of volunteers. Now, under the resolution, each of those two boards has to contribute the same number of men, although one has a credit of 1,000 volunteers. They say if you put all the volunteers in class 1 of the county contributing the class 1 would be increased, and that would make up the difference. Let us see how that works: Suppose the call is for 50 per cent of class 1. Under the resolution each board would contribute 500 men. Under the credit system the first county would contribute 500 men unreduced by credit; and 50 per cent of the second county with 1,000 volunteers added to its class 1 would be 1,000, which would be reduced by a credit of 1,000 to none. So that one county would contribute 500 and the other none by virtue of the credit for its volunteers. It is perfectly evident, therefore, that credit is not given a county by reason of the fact that its volunteers are not placed in class 1.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this bill may be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all those who may speak on this bill may have unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to us all that in 10 minutes no one familiar with the customs or the atmosphere of the House of Representatives could expect to dwell to any considerable extent and to much completed purpose on the true merits of this proposition, because this proposition resolves itself down not so much into a matter of mathematics as it does into a question of philosophy, and I mean a practical philosophy, the philosophy upon which this country was organized and the philosophy upon which it must be maintained, or else it will fall. In other words, while we have been listening to some of our distinguished colleagues, who with great earnestness and in all good faith have dwelt upon what seems to them to be the real crux of this question, I could not help thinking all the time that this is a question of a terrible national war and not of neighborhood militia bookkeeping. It makes all the difference in the world whether you approach the question from the viewpoint of trying to keep the count of each town and hamlet and county and district with mathematical exactness, so that no man shall go out of one region to fight for the country until an equivalent number of men have gone out of another region, or whether we shall follow the spirit and philosophy we see all through those brilliant romances of Dumas, which romances are now being reenacted so gloriously in real life on the fields of France. "Each for all and all for each."

It is not a question of mathematics. It is a question of national purpose and one common purpose of a people who are truly nationalized. [Applause.]

Now, if we depend upon the process of apportioning the quotas of States by the naked figures of the State's population, it is manifest at once that the very ratio we use for determining how many people shall be sent out of that State for war is itself an undependable factor, because when we get down into the figures of population that make that ratio to get the men to send to war we find part of that population ineligible, part exempt on statutory grounds, part physically unfit, and part aliens, or in this and that or the other status of unavailability. And we do not start, therefore, with a constant factor. If we start, on the other hand, by apportioning to each State as its quota that number of soldiers under the ratio that the number of men in each class in that State available for military service bears to the total of the men in that class in the 48 States, then we are figuring all the time on the men who are liable to go, are available to go, and in the most part must go, and our factor is almost constant. Of course, it can not be absolutely constant, because physical examination or other consideration may disturb it, but it is certainly static to the extent that it eliminates all the people that we know will not go in all circumstances.

But, says our friend who proposes the amendment, instead of making the apportionment based upon a ratio of class by class—that is to say, taking that proportion to the total of the country in class 1 which one State number in class 1 bears to that total—we ought to take the total of all the registrants in that State and make that the ratio as it relates to the total of all the registrants in all of the States. But I think one may easily see on second thought that if we do this we are practically getting back again to the uncertainties of the old population basis more or less. Because, while we are now expecting only to take out of class 1 for the purposes of this war, broadly speaking, and almost completely speaking, we are by

his process still estimating the number of men we shall take out of class 1 on the basis of reckoning and including also the number of men in classes 2, 3, and 4, whom we do not expect to take.

There is no mathematical justice in that, if we are trying to get an accurate and fair apportionment and distribution on the basis of bookkeeping.

I can not expect to dwell, even if you had the patience to listen now, in amplification of these ideas, and I am glad to believe that I am talking to men who need only a suggestion; they will know how to apply the reasoning, if, happily, there is any reason in my suggestions.

Again, our friends in the minority report contend that these young men having drawn out of the box a number, their relation to the call for military service ought to be in all justice and equity by that fact fixed and determined, and that it is unfair and unjust to these young men now to disturb that order in which they were to have been called. Well, that would be all right if we sat over the green cloth with the cards, where the code determined our relations to one another. If this drawing of the ball out of the urn, the gambler's hazard, is to determine what allegiance he owes to and what sacrifice a man must make for his country, then we certainly have departed from the old idea, that no matter when his turn came, or when his country needed or called him, it should be a man's duty not to stand upon the order of his going but to go at once. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Of course, you have defined very fully there the voluntary system; but these men who have already been drafted into the service were drafted because their ball happened to come first.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. True; but suppose this country, with no experience of a draft law to govern it, undertook an experiment, as it did; we have had since that experiment began now nearly one year of experience under it. The Provost Marshal General has compiled statistics as to the operation of this experiment; and what would we be, what kind of legislators would we be, if we should shut our eyes to the significance of the lesson taught us all through those archives of his, that the experiments conducted through the year showed many things which no human being could have foreseen or have anticipated or provided for in the statute law; and that knowing those things, knowing how indirectly and obliquely, sometimes, this law had begun to work in places, to the manifest injustice of communities and of men, we should still say, "No; we will stake all on that little lead pellet that was drawn out of the urn and will not change it." How absurd! [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A matter that has given very considerable trouble about this legislation is this: As I understand, in classifying the men under the questionnaire, different rules were adopted from those which the local and district boards operated on the first classification. In other words, there are thousands now gone into the service who, if they had been examined under the questionnaire, would have had a different classification, a district classification. Is that correct or not?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I presume it must have in some individual instances worked out that way.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is the gentleman sure it is only in a few instances?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not know, because, of course, it is obvious that the individual instances have not been inquired into to get their aggregate; the men are in the service, and they are gone, and, fair or not, it is an accomplished fact.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The justice of basing the draft on registrants instead of on population has appealed to me very strongly, but that which has given me most trouble is the change in the classification under the questionnaire and under the original registration.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. FIELDS. Under the questionnaire they have a system of rules under which the local board operates. Under the old system they left discretion to the boards.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But does not the fact remain that there are thousands of men—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two more minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I can not do much in two minutes. Mr. FIELDS. Then I yield to the gentleman five minutes. The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Another point that has been raised here—and I must trust again to your kind indulgence; you will do your thinking for yourselves and make your own application of my mere scant suggestions—another thing suggested by our friends is that this is a great departure from any contemplated idea of universal military service. Now, to state the words “universal military service” to a company like this means to carry with it incidentally the idea of its utter impossibility. There is no such thing, there can be no such thing as universal military service. If all the people of one country were out in the field to fight all the people of another country, the war would last about 24 hours.

There must be some means of sustaining armies in the field. That is obvious. The question simply comes down as to the most practicable way of determining what men shall be left at home to sustain the army in the field, and that is not a matter of geography, but a matter of personal availability and fitness. If you are to determine that by geography, then you upset all the schemes of logic by which men transact their own private business. They would pick out men to stay at home to make munitions who ought to stay there, and they would send men to fight who ought to fight. It is humanly impossible, of course, to make that distribution absolutely equal. It is humanly impossible to make it absolutely exact. Nothing that we can do will be anything more, perhaps, than a well-intentioned approximation. But if we depend on the philosophy that is behind the selection of men by the terms of class 1, we have practically approximated what the experience of this year, in dealing with the selective-service law as it was first instituted, permits us to believe is the safest and the fairest way.

Then it is urged by our friends that if we favor this bill as it stands, it is only another way of protecting from active military service those people who live in districts where the munitions plants are. Well, we all start, of course, with the proposition that we have got to have the munitions plants or else we will not have any army in the field at all. We all start with the next proposition that the munitions plants must be somewhere, or else there will not be any. Then some men must work in them, or else there is no use having them at all. Now, will those people in the regions where there are no munitions plants send their men over to us where there are munitions plants, and thus avoid having those men put into the military service? Obviously our general population is not distributed, and we can not distribute it, with reference to the munitions plants. So it comes down again to the simple, practical matter of expediency, of taking those men to operate the munitions plants where the munitions plants are, and where the men are absolutely needed to operate those plants, regardless of geography, or else you will have no army in the field, whether you have any geography or not.

If in the old days when this Government was founded we had proceeded on the idea that because there was not a munitions plant in some particular locality we would not go into the war, where would we be now? Apply the analogy to my home region in New England. If all the pioneer settlers there who did not live within 50 miles of a blockhouse had said, “We will not chase off Indians and fight redcoats, because there is no blockhouse in our neighborhood,” then we who sit in the House of Representatives of the United States of America would not be here to-day, and there would be no House of Representatives and no United States of America.

Then, the next objection proposed here is that, while this may be good for a general law, the weakness of it is in local enforcement; that exemption boards here, there, or somewhere else may not play square with the Nation, and therefore, because they will not play fair with the Nation, will defeat the general purpose of the law. I am not a lawyer, but I am familiar with one legal phrase which runs in Latin, “Abusus non tollit usum”—the abuse of a thing is no argument against its proper use. If we say that we will never pass a national law because it will have to be enforced in 48 different States, with the varying personal equations in the minds, temperaments, and habits of the men who are to enforce it, then our Government is a failure. You and I know that we ought not to deny the efficacy of the application of a general principle because of the fact that somewhere at some time it may be abused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Another thing ought to be borne in mind as one of the practical aspects of this situation and the proposition submitted here. It should be remembered that it is the avowed purpose of the Provost Marshal General in his calls for men to exhaust the availables in class 1 in all the States before he makes a call for the men of class 2 in any State. Therefore when all the men in class 1 in any State have gone, that State will not furnish more men under the call until all the class 1 men in the whole country are gone. If it is true, therefore, that in some neighborhoods the exemption board will be so unfair as to exclude men from class 1 who ought to be there, all they are going to do in the long run is to bring nearer by just that same proportion the time when the country will have to go into class 2, and then their men certainly will be drawn.

There is no escape from that. The more men you leave out of class 1 the quicker class 1 is exhausted by the call and the quicker you get into class 2. Thus you have not gained anything by it, not a thing.

The question of getting credit for volunteers is a moot one. There is much to be said on both sides, and I think you will agree with me, partly at least, when you come to the second thought about this matter, that when you are exempting a man to-day from the service of his country because another man went before him you are resorting to something little short of the old Civil War “substitute” proposition, that is, that one man need not go by compulsion because another man went willingly. Perhaps both men ought to go. When you come to analyze what the credit system means that can not be a matter of mathematics; it is a question of principle.

I would like to continue, but I can not abuse your patience any longer, and my time has run out. It is a broad, deep, and tremendously important subject. I realize the good faith of those men who oppose this law, but I believe it is time for us to forget our own neighborhoods in the contemplation of the whole noble country and the solemn call to patriotic duty that rings through it to-day. We must all turn in to save each other or surely all will be lost. On the battle field of France you have two great nations that have surrendered their national prejudices and put themselves under the hands of one commander, a Frenchman. Great Britain, stubborn Great Britain, is no longer attached to her neighborhood idea of controlling her own army. It is time for us, too, to give up all this idea of a bookkeeping account of our proportionate local sacrifices and all of us fight for Uncle Sam, no matter how many men are needed, no matter where they come from, and no matter where they are to go. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, the War and Navy Departments have furnished me with a list of States showing the number of men enlisted. I ask unanimous consent to place it in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter is as follows:

Number ordered to camp up to Apr. 10, 1918.

United States.	White and colored, first and second draft—General.	White and colored—Special.
Alabama.....	17,631	93
Arizona.....	4,030	25
Arkansas.....	12,817	30
California.....	29,158	575
Colorado.....	6,175	203
Connecticut.....	13,950	795
Delaware.....	1,651	34
District of Columbia.....	1,523	60
Florida.....	8,075	25
Georgia.....	23,348	25
Idaho.....	3,131	1
Illinois.....	60,115	739
Indiana.....	22,475	950
Iowa.....	16,151	1,731
Kansas.....	8,147	101
Kentucky.....	17,041	507
Louisiana.....	16,429
Maine.....	3,157	110
Maryland.....	9,548	150
Massachusetts.....	28,251	883
Michigan.....	35,831	1,002
Minnesota.....	21,241	2,060
Mississippi.....	13,311	31
Missouri.....	23,308	1,423
Montana.....	9,635	30
Nebraska.....	10,111	76
Nevada.....	1,302
New Hampshire.....	1,930	60

Number ordered to camp up to Apr. 10, 1918—Continued.

United States.	White and colored, first and second draft—General.	White and colored—Special.
New Jersey.....	27,077	281
New Mexico.....	2,821	
New York.....	91,215	1,734
North Carolina.....	20,232	50
North Dakota.....	6,303	60
Ohio.....	50,601	735
Oklahoma.....	18,353	50
Oregon.....	2,003	100
Pennsylvania.....	77,623	1,149
Rhode Island.....	3,323	224
South Carolina.....	12,393	63
South Dakota.....	3,633	36
Tennessee.....	18,517	77
Texas.....	33,905	355
Utah.....	3,235	25
Vermont.....	1,621	60
Virginia.....	17,038	75
Washington.....	9,530	100
West Virginia.....	11,651	102
Wisconsin.....	16,415	350
Wyoming.....	1,273	20
Alaska.....		
Hawaii.....		
Porto Rico.....		
Total.....	853,837	17,378

All men ordered is the sum of columns "General" and "Special."
Total, 871,215 sent to camps for drafted Army.

Number of enlistments by States from Apr. 6, 1917, to Feb. 18, 1918.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1918.

Alabama.....	1,908
Arizona.....	646
Arkansas.....	1,826
California.....	5,430
Colorado.....	2,527
Connecticut.....	2,536
Delaware.....	838
District of Columbia.....	729
Florida.....	1,006
Georgia.....	2,398
Idaho.....	638
Illinois.....	9,072
Indiana.....	3,879
Iowa.....	3,602
Kansas.....	2,388
Kentucky.....	2,129
Louisiana.....	2,415
Maine.....	1,264
Maryland.....	1,578
Massachusetts.....	6,259
Michigan.....	3,336
Minnesota.....	4,027
Mississippi.....	1,659
Missouri.....	5,946
Montana.....	1,289
Nebraska.....	2,264
Nevada.....	202
New Hampshire.....	536
New Jersey.....	3,131
New Mexico.....	515
New York.....	13,183
North Carolina.....	1,271
North Dakota.....	823
Ohio.....	3,771
Oklahoma.....	2,424
Oregon.....	2,301
Pennsylvania.....	8,118
Rhode Island.....	994
South Carolina.....	1,480
South Dakota.....	795
Tennessee.....	2,353
Texas.....	8,940
Utah.....	713
Vermont.....	454
Virginia.....	2,673
Washington.....	1,249
West Virginia.....	2,158
Wisconsin.....	2,071
Wyoming.....	296
Total.....	132,190

Total number of men enlisted or enrolled in the United States Navy from Apr. 6, 1917, to Feb. 18, 1918.

Total increase in the—	
Regular service.....	132,190
Naval Reserve.....	53,986
National Naval Volunteers.....	15,000

Making a grand total in the United States Navy..... 201,176

NOTE.—Records to show Reserves and National Naval Volunteers by States not complete.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Under the leave to extend my remarks I insert the following table:

Summary of classification as shown by reports received from States in response to Provost Marshal General's Office telegram c-257, Apr. 2, 1918.

State.	Date.	Classified.	Class 1.	Pending.	Per cent class 1 to total classified.
Alabama.....	Mar. 31	167,045	51,823	2,248	31
Arizona.....	Mar. 27	29,806	5,944	65	22
Arkansas.....	Mar. 29	141,526	43,225	883	31
California.....	do	123,023	25,376	1,481	21
Colorado.....	Mar. 31	74,314	17,541	478	24
Connecticut.....	Mar. 27	137,478	31,265	3,079	23
Delaware.....	do	19,695	5,394	283	27
District of Columbia.....	Mar. 31	29,461	10,166	63	35
Florida.....	Mar. 27	74,185	26,365	350	36
Georgia.....	Apr. 1	213,839	68,130	11,142	32
Idaho.....	Mar. 27	33,024	10,243	532	27
Illinois.....	Mar. 28	545,956	150,703	13,801	28
Indiana.....	Mar. 27	230,640	67,709	6,088	26
Iowa.....	Mar. 30	207,815	56,938	938	27
Kansas.....	Mar. 29	116,223	32,984	9,208	28
Kentucky.....	Mar. 31	177,781	50,192	877	28
Louisiana.....	Apr. 2	141,033	52,075	2,122	38
Maine.....	Mar. 27	55,568	18,680	400	33
Maryland.....	do	112,031	33,012	4,324	29
Massachusetts.....	do	319,802	82,732	5,375	26
Michigan.....	Mar. 30	314,148	91,937	5,635	29
Minnesota.....	Mar. 31	203,712	62,670	3,460	31
Mississippi.....	Apr. 1	130,960	42,252	1,917	32
Missouri.....	Mar. 29	281,742	77,580	3,923	28
Montana.....	Mar. 27	78,905	24,502	904	31
Nebraska.....	Mar. 29	104,979	27,350	2,412	26
Nevada.....	Mar. 28	9,466	2,347	164	25
New Hampshire.....	Mar. 27	35,171	9,980	208	28
New Jersey.....	Apr. 2	277,069	69,244	3,371	30
New Mexico.....	Mar. 30	28,286	8,654	660	26
New York.....	Mar. 27	518,713	209,056	10,451	39
North Carolina.....	Apr. 1	190,491	55,682	2,278	29
North Dakota.....	Mar. 31	61,496	18,469	93	30
Ohio.....	Mar. 31	481,888	122,428	11,251	25
Oklahoma.....	do	134,011	39,949	14,751	30
Oregon.....	do	61,067	18,584	2,521	30
Pennsylvania.....	Mar. 28	551,388	132,984	9,607	24
Rhode Island.....	Mar. 27	51,648	13,216	87	26
South Carolina.....	do	118,421	34,788	630	29
South Dakota.....	Mar. 29	54,103	20,423	824	38
Tennessee.....	Mar. 27	177,129	49,230	2,402	28
Texas.....	Mar. 31	364,930	100,598	10,281	28
Utah.....	Mar. 31	40,040	8,873	168	22
Vermont.....	Mar. 27	25,283	6,608	145	30
Virginia.....	Mar. 31	161,771	48,694	2,192	30
Washington.....	Mar. 27	101,573	23,893	307	23
West Virginia.....	Mar. 30	114,057	35,515		31
Wisconsin.....	Mar. 27	228,839	60,939		29
Wyoming.....	Mar. 31	21,211	8,546	1,041	43
Total.....		8,175,263	2,265,445	155,691	27.71

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, by unanimous consent, was given leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert two telegrams in the Record in regard to the liberty loan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The telegrams are as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., April 10, 1918.

Hon. WILLIAM E. MASON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Requirement of full payment of income taxes in June is seriously hampering the banks of this district in financing liberty-loan purchases for their customers and working great hardship on individuals and corporations desiring to buy liberty bonds. If payment of taxes in installments is permitted it will greatly relieve this situation and contribute materially to the success of the third liberty loan in the great Middle West.

H. L. STUART,

Director of Campaign.

HEMAN GIFFORD,

Illinois Director of Sales.

GEORGE H. DUNSCOMB,

Indiana Director of Sales.

WM. L. ROSS,

Wisconsin Director of Sales.

F. R. FENTON,

Michigan Director of Sales.

C. H. MCNIDER,

Iowa Director of Sales.

CHAS. W. FOLDS,

Chicago and Cook County Director of Sales of the Liberty

Loan Campaign Committee, Seventh Federal Reserve District.

CANTON, ILL., April 10, 1918.

Hon. WILLIAM E. MASON,

Congress Hall Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Requirements of full payment of income tax in June is seriously hampering banks of this district in financing liberty-loan purchases for

their customers. It is also working great hardship to industrials and corporations desiring to buy liberty bonds. If payment of taxes in installments is permitted it will greatly relieve this situation and contribute materially to successes of the liberty loan in the great Middle West.

U. G. ORENFORFF,
Chairman Fulton County Liberty Loan Committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on April 10, 1918, approved and signed bills of the following title:

H. R. 2316. An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes; and

S. 3400. An act to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 12, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Public Printer, transmitting schedules of useless files of papers and records of the office of the superintendent of documents that are no longer of any value or use to that office (H. Doc. No. 1034); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of War submitting a claim for damages by river and harbor work which has been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of War (H. Doc. No. 1035); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of Arthur Wendle Englert, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 484), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3106) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Keefe, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 1392) to authorize the coinage of 15-cent pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WHALEY: A bill (H. R. 11393) to authorize the Columbia Railway & Navigation Co. to construct a canal connecting the Santee River and the Cooper River in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Resolution (H. Res. 307) directing the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to institute an examination of the accounts and expenditures of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 308) providing for pay for examiner detailed to the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the Bureau of Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 11394) granting a pension to Bertha Zwickler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 11395) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Lord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 11396) granting an increase of pension to Allen B. O'Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 11397) granting an increase of pension to Montrose Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11398) granting a pension to Mary M. Gun-solus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11399) granting a pension to Jane Tilly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11400) granting an increase of pension to John T. Glover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11401) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Seiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11402) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Larkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 11403) granting an increase of pension to David W. McMeen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 11404) granting an increase of pension to G. S. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 11405) granting a pension to Lillie E. Justice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 11406) granting a pension to James R. Mowry; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of New York State Ice Manufacturers' Association, against passage of increased second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Boy Scouts of America, pledging help in every way to win the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the county and ward workers of the La Crosse County (Wis.) Council of Defense, favoring giving power to Food Administrator to commandeer the barley in the malt houses in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of C. E. Lufkin, Mahaska County, Iowa, asking law to permit payment of Federal taxes in installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of the Bismarck Clearing House Association on April 5, 1918, recommending that the payment of income tax and excess-profits taxes be permitted upon the installment plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 12, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in these terrible times we bless Thee that the American people are learning to pray. We have found from the problems confronting us that human wisdom is not sufficient for human life and that the power of the human arm, no matter how great, how strong, is not sufficient for the battle of life. We turn to Thee, the God of all nations and of all men, whose mighty arm is not weakened and who has still power to save. We pray that Thou wilt guide us and make us Thine own instruments for the establishment of justice and peace and brotherhood in all the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore assumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Saturday, April 6, 1918, when, on request of Mr. OVERMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

STREETS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 213).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 1st instant, a report relative to the proceedings that have been instituted for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of alleys and minor streets in the city of Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 2917. An act to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual